

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII

August 1920

NUMBER 4

A NINTH-CENTURY ASTRONOMICAL TREATISE

In the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* for 1907 (Vol. XXVI, Section C, pp. 381-445) there was printed for the first time a Latin computistical treatise compiled by a ninth-century Irish continental teacher named Dicuil.¹ The sole surviving MS of Dicuil's treatise is now preserved in the Bibliothèque Municipale of Valenciennes, where it is classed N. 4. 43 (No. 386 in the *Catalogue* of Mangeart,² and 404 in that of Molinier).³ Previously it had belonged to the monastery of Elnon at Saint-Amand, to which it appears to have been given by Hucbaldus (840-930), who may also have been its scribe.⁴ It was brought to Valenciennes during the period of the French Revolution. It is a parchment quarto of 118 leaves measuring 21.9 by 14.8 cms., written in long lines with 26 to the page. Titles are in capitals sometimes of violet color. Initials are in red or lilac. The volume is bound in wood covered with vellum. The writing is in excellent Caroline minuscules of the latter part of the ninth century—possibly the work of Hucbaldus,⁵

¹ For an account of Dicuil and his writings cf. Esposito, *Studies*, III (1914), pp. 651-76.

² *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Valenciennes*, Paris, 1860, pp. 375-77.

³ *Catal. gén. des MSS des Bibl. Publ. de France, Départements*, T. XXV (1894), pp. 365-66.

⁴ This we learn from the twelfth-century catalogue of the Saint-Amand library published by Delisle, *Le Cabinet des MSS de la Bibl. Nationale*, T. II (1874), p. 451, No. 93.

⁵ For whom see Manitius, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, I (1911), p. 590.

as mentioned above. When at Saint-Amand, the MS was numbered N. 270. In the inventory printed by Sanderus¹ it is N. 247. The contents of the volume are:

Ff. 1a-26b: Isidori *Etymologiarum Liber ii.*²

Ff. 27a-56b: *Disputatio de Rethorica et de Virtutibus sapientissimi Regis Karoli et Albini Magistri.*³

F. 57a: *Sententiae Septem Sapientium.* See Mullach, *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*, I (1860), p. 235.

Ff. 57a-60a: A series of diagrams illustrating the divisions and subdivisions of philosophy, commencing at the bottom of f. 57a.

Ff. 60b-62a: *Origenis Prologus in Canticum Canticorum.* See Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, XIII, cols. 61 sqq.

Ff. 62b-65a: *Dicta Sybillae Magae. Non multi, non vel pauci . . . nullus postea insanam me dicet, sed dei magam.* Then follow about 135 verses, *Mundus origo mea est, animam de sidere traxi. . . . Vita brevis hominis finita solvitur annis.*⁴

F. 65b: Twenty-seven hexameters, *Iudicii signum tellus sudore madescet Precedet e celo ignisque et sulfuris amnis.* For this famous poem see Haupt, *Opuscula*, I (1875), p. 289; Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, p. 187; *Oracula Sibyllina* bearb. von J. Geffcken, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 154-55. This copy has not been collated.

Ff. 66a-118a: Dicuil's *Computus*, without either title or scribal *explicit*.

F. 118b: blank.

The scribe has evidently taken great pains in transcribing Dicuil's *Computus*, for he has made many corrections in his own work. As Manitius⁵ remarks, he appears to have taken to heart Dicuil's line (p. 413, l. 6), *Rustica ne scribant has membra caveto loquelas*. Other corrections are due to later hands. Palaeographically the script presents all the characteristics of late ninth-century Caroline minuscule.⁶ The combination *ae* is frequently so written, but we also find *ę* and simply *e*. In the matter of spelling we find the usual peculiarities and inconsistencies, e.g., *ymnus*, *rythmus* and *rithmus*, *ciclus*, *dyptongus*, *dactilus*, *pirgis*, *inicio*, *nunciabo*, *renunciabo*,

¹ *Bibliotheca Belgica Manuscripta*, Insulis, 1641, Pars I, pp. 54-55.

² This copy is not mentioned in Lindsay's recent edition (Oxford, 1911).

³ For this work see Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-83, who does not mention this copy.

⁴ There is a copy of this tract in the Bodleian MS Auct. T. 2. 23, ff., 88b-93a, of saec. X.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 650.

⁶ The facsimile given in the Academy's edition (Plate XXII) represents f. 67a (not 67b as stated).

but *nuntiatas*, *nuntiatio*, etc., *endecas*, *scemata*, *disticon*, *scola*, *audatia*, *suptilis*, *linia* and *linea*, *zoziaco*, *distingitur*, *pasca* and *pascha*, *pascalis* and *paschalis*, *decennovennalis* and *decennovenalis*, *compotus*, *spaciosae*, *repperitur* and *reperitur*, *anastaseos*, *adfirmatur*, *reuma*, *adissa*.

Dicuil's *Computus* was long attributed to Alcuin,¹ a mistake which arose from the note of contents in a twelfth-century hand on f. 1a of the MS, *Item rethorica Albini ad Karolum et computus eiusdem ad eundem*. The true authorship was first pointed out in 1855 by Bethmann.² A transcript of the tract was made by J. Heller³ in 1875, from which Dümmler⁴ printed some of the verses, including the two *Ymni per rythmum facti* (I, 9, and II, 7, ed. pp. 397, 405). The structure of these verses was investigated by Ebert,⁵ and by Wilhelm Meyer.⁶ The latter printed the third *Ymnus* (II, 14, ed. p. 414), and pointed out that Dicuil is an early example of a writer who uses hexameters with end-rhymes. Subsequent to the publication of the Academy's edition in 1907, a summary analysis of the work was given by Dr. Max Manitius.⁷

The *Computus* is divided into four books (*Libelli*), and is written partly in prose and partly in verse. As a scientific exposition its value is small. The arrangement is chaotic and the chapters follow one another in the most arbitrary manner imaginable. The treatment of the subject is anything but clear and the work is in fact a clumsy complication extracted from previous writers. Dicuil wrote, as we shall presently see, in France in the years 814-16, at a period when, thanks to the Carolingian revival of learning, astronomical (or rather computistical) studies were being cultivated with extraordinary interest at the Frankish court. To the early works of

¹ E.g., by Sanderus (*loc. cit.*), by the authors of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, VI (1742), pp. ix-x, and by Mangeart (*loc. cit.*), who printed the five opening hexameters. Sanderus had given the index of chapters.

² *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XI (1855), p. 521.

³ *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft, etc.*, II (1877), p. 305.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV (1879), pp. 256-58, and *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poetae*, II (1884), p. 668.

⁵ *Allgemeine Gesch. der Lit. des Mittelalters*, II (1880), pp. 392-93.

⁶ *Sitzungsberichte der Philos.-Philol. Classe der Münchener Akademie*, I (1882), pp. 68 n., 91, 94, 97, and *Gesammelte Abh. zur mittellateinischen Rythmik*, I (1905), pp. 193, 194, 195, 216, 220, 222.

⁷ *Gesch. d. lat. Lit.*, etc., I (1911), pp. 649-51; see a note by Hellmann, *Neues Archiv*, XXXVI (1911), p. 623.

Victorius of Aquitaine (*Cursus Paschalis*, ed. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, I [1892], pp. 669 *sqq.*), of Dionysius Exiguus¹ (ap. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LXVII, cols. 19-28 and 483-520), of Isidore of Seville (*Etymologiarum* vi. 17), to the series of tracts edited by Bruno Krusch (*Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig, 1880), and to the later works of Beda (*De Ratione Computi; De Temporum Ratione; De Temporibus*; ap. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, XC), and the so-called "Munich Computus"² of 718, were now added the great astronomico-computistical compilation of the latter part of the eighth century³ and the tracts derived from it, such as the *De Cursu et Saltu Lunae ac Bissexto* of Alcuin⁴ (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, CI, 981-1002), the anonymous *Liber de Computo* drawn up in 810, published by Muratori,⁵ and reprinted by Migne (*PL*, CXXIX, 1275-1372), and the extensive compilations of about 809 and 811-12, of which numerous MSS are in existence.⁶ It was from these works that writers such as Dungal (811)⁷ and Dicuil (814-16), employed at the Carolingian court, were able to derive their tracts. It is noteworthy that the discussion in verse at the commencement of Book II of Dicuil's work (ed. pp. 398-400), on the distances between heaven and earth and between the seven planets according to the estimate of Pythagoras and the ancient pagan sages is taken directly from the *Historia Naturalis* of Pliny (ii, 21, 83; 22, 84; 23, 85, ed. Sillig, 1851), a book from which Dicuil made very large extracts in his later tract *De Mensura Orbis Terrae*.⁸ The vague references to

¹ Dicuil mentions this writer by name (ed. p. 424, l. 12), though he has probably taken the reference from later compilations.

² See on this still unprinted work MacCarthy, *Annals of Ulster*, IV (1901), pp. lxxvii-lxxiv.

³ A thorough investigation of this work is much to be desired; cf. K. Rück, *Auszüge aus der Naturgeschichte des Plinius in einem astronomisch-komputistischen Sammelwerke des achten Jahrhunderts*, München, 1888; Manitius, *Gesch.*, I, pp. 286, 373, 447.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 285-87.

⁵ *Anecdota ex Ambros. Bibl. Codicibus*, III, Patavii, 1713, pp. 114-203; cf. Gabriel Meier, *Die sieben freien Künste im Mittelalter*, II (1887), pp. 6-7 (*Programm des Stiftes Einsiedeln, Studienjahr 1886-87*).

⁶ E.g., four at Paris (cf. Delisle, *Cat. des MSS des fonds Libri et Barrois*, 1888, pp. 63-68, 72-76, 76-78, 81-84), one at Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, L. 95, of tenth century, and Monte Cassino 3 (cf. *Bibl. Casinensis*, I (1873), pp. 84 *sqq.*, and *ibid.*, *Florilegium*, pp. 57-96); Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 286, 373, 447. Further investigation of these MSS is much to be desired.

⁷ Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 373-74.

⁸ See on this point Esposito, *Studies*, III (1914), p. 665.

"Pagani" or "Philosophi" (ed. pp. 415, 441, 444) are taken from Isidore of Seville (*Etymol.* iii. 31-70; V, 30, 5-8, etc.).¹

As a teacher of grammar Dicuil took a great interest in metrical subjects, and one of the special attractions by which he sought to please King Louis the Pious, to whom he dedicated his work, was the introduction of two chapters (i. 8, and ii. 13, pp. 392 and 408) entitled *De ludificis versibus*, in the first of which four hexameters are so constructed that the four verse-endings being retained they may be transformed into 72 hexameters which yield a quasi-meaning, and in the second the permutation is carried to produce 166 verses. Dicuil's model here is the poet Optatianus Porphyrius (c. 350 A.D.),² whose ingenious constructions were very popular and often imitated in the Caroline and pre-Caroline epochs.³ This poet's *Carmen 25^a* (*recens.* L. Müller, Lipsiae, 1877, pp. 26-28) is closely followed by Dicuil both for the construction of the four verses and for the method of permuting them.⁴

Reference has already been made to the three *Ymni per rythmum facti*. Other evidences of grammatical interest are the mention of Donatus (ed. p. 395, l. 36), and the lines at the end of the work (p. 445, ll. 11-27), the last of which is a quotation from Vergil (*Aeneid* i. 374). At p. 444, ll. 13-20, he points out the difficulty of being always clear in the treatment of technical subjects in verse, and states that he had for that reason dealt with some questions both metrically and in prose.

A few references to the Bible⁵ may be noted.

The following information concerning Dicuil's personal history may be obtained from the *Computus*:

¹ There is as yet no comprehensive treatment of the history of astronomy in the early Middle Ages; cf. Sickel, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte, Ph.-Hist. Classe, XXXVIII* (1862), pp. 153-201; Meier, *Sieben freien Künste*, II (1887), pp. 3-15, 22-36; Cantor, *Vorlesungen über Gesch. der Mathematik*, I, 2^a Aufl. (1894), pp. 495, 532, 780 sqq.; MacCarthy, *Annals of Ulster*, IV, pp. xiv-clxxxii.

² Cf. Teuffel, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, 6^a Aufl., III (1913), pp. 216-17.

³ Manitius, *Gesch.*, I, p. 754. Beda *De arte metrica*, cap. xxiv (*PL*, XC, 173), speaks of the *insigne volumen Porphyrii Poetae*.

⁴ In the older editions (*PL*, XLX, 431) it is numbered 26.

⁵ On p. 394, l. 5, remove stop after *solis*; p. 411, l. 5, correct *verbis* to *ciclos*; p. 411, l. 41, is clearly wrong; p. 412, l. 3, correct *verbis* to *ciclos*; p. 413, l. 4, correct *ciclos* to *verbis*.

⁶ E.g., p. 389, l. 33, cf. III Reg. 17:11; p. 390, ll. 20-21, cf. Luc. 21:2-3; p. 432, l. 32, cf. Luc. 23:54-56; p. 432, l. 40, cf. Luc. 1:26.

Dicuil was the author (ed. pp. 390, l. 13, 395, l. 21); he was an Irishman (p. 388, l. 23); he was living in France, possibly in the capacity of a teacher of grammar at the court school (p. 444, l. 23), and compiled his treatise as a series of yearly gifts to Charlemagne's successor, Louis the Pious (pp. 382, l. 28, 389, l. 32, 390, l. 12, 395, l. 20, 396, l. 39, 404, l. 30, 408, l. 28, 413, l. 5, 414, l. 22, 439, l. 17); the first book was commenced in April 814 (p. 383, l. 7), and the fourth chapter was written on the 18th day of that month (p. 386, l. 20); Dicuil intended to present this book to Louis on the occasion of the Frankish festival on May 14 when the nobles would be making their annual presents¹ to the king (ed. p. 390, l. 17), but Louis does not appear to have been pleased with the Irishman's labors, for the latter complains (p. 395, l. 39) that though he was present while Dicuil was reciting his verses he would not listen nor offer any reward; the second book was composed in 815 (ed. pp. 402, l. 9, 414, l. 25), and Dicuil states that should anything in it appear obscure to the king he will explain it when they meet (p. 414, l. 21); the date of the third book is not given, but the fourth was completed in 816 (p. 444, l. 39), when, as he tells us (p. 440, l. 37), he was living far away from the sea. At p. 444, l. 12, he notes the unsatisfactory nature of his source (Isidore of Seville) and states that if anybody else would furnish a better account of the subject under discussion he would willingly adopt it.

Dicuil's *Computus* appears to have remained totally unknown down to modern times. Later ninth-century writers on the same subject, e.g., Hrabanus Maurus of Fulda whose *De Computo*² was written in 820, and Helericus of Auxerre, whose work with the same title³ dates from about 850, had no knowledge of Dicuil. Indeed the fact that we possess only one MS of his work shows that it was a complete failure and was but rarely copied.

The printed text of the *Computus* shows many signs of ignorance, misreading of the MS, and inexperience on the part of the editor.

¹ On this custom cf. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, IV, 2^a Aufl. (1885), pp. 107-11, and *Hibernici Ezulii Carmen* II, v. 8 ap. Dümmler, *Poetae*, I (1881), p. 396.

² Ed. Baluze, *Miscellanea*, cura Mansi, II, Lucae, 1761, pp. 62-84; Migne, *PL*, CVIII, 669-728.

³ Migne, *PL*, CXXXVII, 17-48. Both Hrabanus and Helericus are superior to Dicuil in clearness of exposition and orderly arrangement. Their tracts were widely read.

These deficiencies may perhaps be condoned when it is remembered that at the date of publication (August, 1907) the editor was nineteen years of age. In the following pages I give a collation of the printed text with the original MS, and also suggest some emendations which appear to me to be necessary:

P. 381, ll. 8-9, Dicuili . . . *Astronomia, this title is not in the MS*; l. 17, *decennovennalibus MS*; p. 382, l. 12, *decennovennali MS*; l. 17, *for saltu the MS corrects bissexto in the margin*; ll. 26-27, *Libellus . . . I, title not in MS*; l. 29, *Per ludum MS*; l. 32, *numquam MS*; p. 383, l. 3, *fiant MS*; l. 4, *primae quę MS*; l. 8, *quę MS*; l. 20, *quotcumque MS*; p. 384, l. 20, *sublati MS*; l. 23, *manifeste MS*; p. 385, l. 7, *uel cum MS*; l. 13, *for at MS has ac*; l. 17, *numquam MS*; l. 36 *for diurnum MS has diuinum*; l. 37, *read mensium, and for last word aut MS has uel*; p. 386, l. 1, *concluditur et quoniam MS*; l. 4, *for summa MS has sancta*; l. 15, *for iniamus MS has uiuamus*; l. 23, *superfuerant MS*; l. 27, *praenuntiatas MS*; l. 35, *read subtractos*; l. 36, *superfuerint and superesse MS*; l. 37, *superfuerit MS*; l. 38, *for tali MS has uel alio*; l. 39, *peruenire MS*; p. 387, l. 19, *supersunt MS*; l. 24, *superesse MS*; l. 37, *remove commas after Martii and Septembri*; l. 39, *remove commas after Martii and Novembri*; p. 388, l. 28, *falletue MS*; l. 38, *sepe MS*;¹ p. 389, l. 3, *for et MS has uel*; l. 7, *super MS*; l. 24, *multitudinem MS*; l. 40, *post consumptum primum MS*; p. 390, l. 8, *per dictos MS*; l. 9, *remove stop after videtur*; l. 14, *remove stop after annos*; l. 15, *peregi MS*; l. 19, *for iulea MS has uilia*; p. 391, l. 13, *in col. 10 MS has XXVI*;² l. 19, *col. 4, MS has XV and in col. 11 it has ii*; l. 25, *col. 1, remove Emb.*; p. 392, l. 13, *col. 11 above xxx insert Emb., and in col. 12 MS has xxviii*; l. 22, *col. 12, MS reads viiii*; p. 393, l. 4, *remove stop after bina*; l. 29, *for L read uel*; p. 395, l. 10, *this line should read as in MS Lucida per longos miscentes famina ciclos*; l. 30, *quocumque MS*; p. 396, l. 1, *remove stop after canto*; l. 9, *for spondet is MS reads spondeis*; l. 13, *prorsus MS*; l. 19, *for summus read summis*; l. 24, *for Tu read In*; l. 28, *for qui MS has quoniam*; l. 39, *for ne of MS we should emend nec*; l. 40, *Franci MS*; l. 41, *read Augusto*; p. 397, l. 22, *read Metaplasmos*; l. 27,

¹ In lines 15 and 19 read *uniusculusque*.

² On p. 391, l. 2, read *tyrannica*.

for Nam read with MS Non; l. 28, for vera read with MS iura; p. 398, ll. 1-2, Libellus . . . I, no title in MS; l. 10, Leuuarum MS; l. 17, leuuarum MS; l. 19, leuuae MS; l. 20, leuuas MS; l. 21, consumunt MS; l. 23, we should perhaps emend to per milia; l. 27, leuuis MS; l. 35, suptili MS; p. 399, l. 1, read praememoratis; l. 8, numerant MS; l. 11, read si milia,¹ l. 12, leuuas MS; l. 13, leuuae MS; l. 32, leuuae MS; l. 38, at the end of this line in the right-hand margin of the MS (f. 79b) is a "signe de renvoi" indicating that two verses written in the lower margin of the MS are to be inserted:

Cum solem adfirmant alii lunamque habitare
In firmamento summo inter sidera fixa.

P. 400, l. 1, this line is defective; ll. 3, 4, these lines to be inserted after p. 399, l. 38, as indicated; l. 5, not in MS; l. 11, multiplica MS; l. 15, after illum a word is effaced; l. 24, diorumque MS; l. 26, for esse MS reads est; l. 27, constat MS; l. 29, for quem MS reads quoniam; l. 32, for regalis erit MS reads regulariter; l. 37, for dominus MS reads deus; p. 401, l. 27, quolibet MS; l. 32, read priori; p. 402, l. 3, spectaveris MS; l. 19, unoquoque MS; l. 36, finiatur MS; p. 403, l. 8, for Ibic read with MS Hic; l. 19, after subtrahere add memento; l. 37, tantundem MS; p. 404, l. 2, antecedente MS; l. 14, tamen MS; l. 17, embolismi MS; l. 28, after secundo insert in alio;² p. 405, l. 1, for cieli read with MS diei; l. 8, for fallerit read with MS fefellerit; l. 14, for videris read volueris; l. 20, for sic read with MS sicut; l. 32, rithmus MS; p. 406, l. 13, for primumque tenet we should perhaps emend primum retinet; l. 27, mundus MS; p. 407, l. 5, saltus MS; l. 10, orti MS; l. 16, nouies MS; p. 408, l. 5, perhaps we should read semper per pasca; l. 11, Illos cum MS; l. 18, octos is clearly wrong; l. 19, for est et the MS has esset; l. 21, quis MS; l. 28, insert comma after rector, and remove comma after multorum; l. 29, for Si MS reads Sis; l. 38, for binae read bina; p. 409, ll. 3-5, these three verses are written in the lower margin of the MS with a "signe de renvoi" for their insertion after p. 409, l. 2; p. 410, l. 5, tardantis MS; p. 410, l. 8, tardantis MS; p. 413, l. 6, read Rustica ne; l. 24, for parabis read with MS porro bis;³ l. 28,

¹ On p. 399, l. 10, read semita.

² In this line numque seems wrong.

³ On p. 413, l. 26, for Si per emend Semper, and on p. 416, l. 17, read continenter.

after this verse insert the line *Postremos scripti qui non sunt sed numerati*; l. 30, remove stop after *valerent*; p. 414, l. 2, for *et MS* reads *uel*; l. 12, *nimpe MS*; l. 23, *Sis MS*; l. 26, *promisum MS*; l. 35, *pirgis MS*; l. 38, after *volo* place a full stop; p. 415, ll. 1-2, title not in *MS*; l. 3, *nimpe MS*; l. 7, read *errantum*; l. 32, heading not in *MS*; l. 33, for *haud* read *quem*, and note that ll. 33 and 34 are to be written as two hexameters; p. 416, l. 9, read *inaequalem*; l. 19, under *die* in the *MS* are three dots meaning that the word is to be omitted; l. 19, read in *sequenti*; l. 32, omit comma after *custodientes*; p. 417, l. 1, title not in *MS*; l. 11, for *diem duorum* the *MS* has *uel duos*; l. 12, *transilias MS*; l. 17, *unoquoque MS*; l. 29, for *Quin MS* reads *Quoniam*; l. 37, for *ast* read *ac*; p. 418, l. 2, *reperietur MS*; l. 3, *iii* is not in *MS*; l. 5, *primo MS*; l. 8, insert comma after *sumet*; l. 11, *scribendum MS*; l. 23, for *Plene his ex bis* read *Plene ex his*; p. 419, l. 5, col. 9, for *ast* read *et*; l. 13, col. 2, *MS* reads *Id.* and so down the column; l. 20, col. 10, insert *i*; l. 24, col. 10, insert *i*; l. 28, col. 10, insert *i*; p. 420, l. 2, read *unoquoque*; l. 20, *tantundem MS*; l. 22, *bissextum MS*; l. 26, *occurrere MS*; l. 37, *iii MS*; l. 38, for *numeri MS* reads *nostri*; l. 39, for *certa* read *certe*; l. 39, for *Quin* read *Quoniam*; l. 41, *cicli MS*; l. 41, comma after *decennovenali*; p. 421, l. 1, comma after *undecimo*; l. 2, comma after *duodecimo*; l. 11, *viii MS*; l. 20, *exordio MS*; l. 34, for *et MS* has *uel*, and for *Quin* it has *Quoniam*; l. 36, for *diem MS* has *diei*; p. 422, l. 18, for *et MS* has *uel*;¹ l. 22, *posse-derit MS*; l. 33, *Quoniam MS*; p. 423, l. 11, *inui cem MS*; l. 15, for *quae MS* has *duae*; l. 16, for *quae MS* has *duae*; l. 17, for *at* read *ac*; l. 22, after *endecadis* the *MS* inserts *anni*; p. 424, l. 9, for *aut MS* reads *uel*; l. 12, for *doni suis exiguis* the *MS* reads *Dionisius Exiguus*; l. 15, for *ast* read *ac*; l. 19, *eadem MS*; l. 21, *nimpe MS*; l. 22, *manserint MS*; l. 23, for *ast* read *ac*; l. 27, for *ast* read *ac*; p. 425, l. 12, read *consummatis*; l. 22, after *die MS* inserts *sancto*; p. 426, l. 2, *transilias MS*; l. 4, read *consummatis*; l. 5, *inter MS*; l. 18, for *ast* read *at*; l. 25, read *transilias*; l. 41, *pascales MS*; p. 427, l. 12, remove stop after *manifestat*; l. 24, in the column of figures under *iii* insert *i*; l. 28, remove comma after *ratione*; p. 428, l. 7, *decennovennali MS*; l. 33, read *additis*; p. 429, l. 32, *viii MS*; l. 33, read *uniuscuiusque*; p. 431, l. 31, heading not in

¹ On p. 422, l. 11, read *anastasseos*.

MS; l. 34, *read hoc est*; p. 432, l. 5, *tantundem MS*; l. 6, *after incarnationis MS adds Domini*;¹ l. 16, *Moysaicum MS*; l. 18, *read imperium*; l. 19, *uigesimi MS*; l. 21, *terram MS*; l. 30, *place a full stop after incipiebant*; l. 30, *Propterea MS*; l. 31, *after sabbati the MS inserts que ante dominicam resurrectionem diei sabbati*; l. 38, *for dominus MS reads deus*; p. 433, ll. 1-2, *heading not in MS*; l. 8, *for de sidere MS reads desidero*; l. 15, *tacent MS*; l. 17, *read incipimus*; l. 30, *Sin MS*; p. 434, l. 2, *read lxxiiae and remove ac*; l. 6, *remove stop after bissexti*; l. 6, *illas MS*; l. 11, *incrementum MS*; l. 14, *remove comma after habeantur*; l. 15, *read unusquisque*; l. 23, *read unumquodque*; l. 32, *integro MS*; p. 435, l. 9, *remove et*; l. 10, *for quam read que*;² l. 15, *read DCCCCLX*; l. 23, *read sexagesima*; l. 24, *for die read dies*; l. 25, *DCCC orum LX MS*; l. 27, *for et read uel*; l. 32, *read adsiissa*; l. 33, *not in MS*; l. 36, *for quin MS has quoniam*; p. 436, l. 11, *for luminis read lunis*; l. 12, *illas MS*; l. 13, *remove comma after pluraliter and insert Et before ab*; l. 15, *for xxx read vi*; p. 437, l. 1, *heading not in MS*; l. 7, *for Quod read Quot*; l. 12, *read deesse*; l. 15, *remove comma after centum*; l. 30, *heading not in MS*; l. 36, *for quae read qui*; l. 37, *read expulimus*; p. 438, l. 8, *read CC tis*; l. 10, *for L read C*; l. 12, *Tantundem MS*; l. 22, *for lunaris read with MS lunas*; l. 24, *read plus quam*; l. 25, *read uniuscuiusque*; l. 30, *for et MS has uel*; l. 31, *place comma after fiant*; p. 439, l. 1, *remove comma after dies*; l. 18, *after sol MS inserts in*; l. 27, *heading not in MS*; l. 35, *for lunare read luna*; p. 440, l. 2, *for xvii read with MS xxii*; l. 3, *remove comma after diebus*; l. 5, *remove comma after diebus*; l. 19, *under second dixi there are four dots in the MS indicating that it is to be omitted*; l. 21, *xxviii MS*; l. 22, *under second numeri six dots for omission*; l. 28, *read tardam*; l. 30, *rursum MS*; p. 441, l. 1, *heading omitted in MS*; l. 10 *for ast read et*; l. 11, *for et read ac*; l. 12, *lxxiii MS*; l. 34, *for at read ac*; l. 36, *read cessante*; l. 37, *after transmigrant place a comma*; p. 442, l. 3, *incessabile MS*; l. 4, *heading not in MS*; l. 9, *omit te*; l. 23, *read bisse with MS*; l. 23, *place comma after horae*; l. 24, *comma after transcurrat*; l. 26, *comma after peragrat*; l. 30, *read bisse*; l. 34, *zoziaci MS*; l. 39,

¹ On p. 432, l. 9, *read calculationis*.

² On p. 435, l. 13, *read uniusculusque*.

xliiii MS; p. 443, l. 8, xiii MS; l. 16, comma after ostento; l. 16, for At and ast read ac; l. 23, zoziacum MS; l. 25, read xxvii; l. 26, read CXL; p. 444, l. 1, under dum in MS are three dots for omission; l. 26, Perfecte MS; l. 27, this line requires emendation; l. 39, remove comma after octo; p. 445, l. 7, for semper read with MS both times sepe; l. 12, for Non perhaps Nam; l. 21, for paria read pariter; l. 25, this line should perhaps be thus emended: Promissis multis iam sero pauca relatu.¹

We may conclude with some remarks on the Latinity of the *Computus*:

For *Aprilis* Dicuil (or the scribe) writes everywhere *Aprelis*, a form which is not registered in any of the standard lexicons (*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Lipsiae, 1900-1915; Georges, *Ausf. Lat.-Deutsches Handwörterbuch*, 8^e Aufl., 4 vols., Leipzig, 1912-19); the form *bisse* (p. 442) for *besse* is given in the *Thesaurus* (s.v. *bes*), and *leuua* (pp. 398, 399) for *leuga*, *leuca*, occurs in Beda and elsewhere (cf. Du Cange, ed. Henschel, s.v. *leuca*). Referring to the tides Dicuil (p. 435) uses the terms *reuma*, *adsissa*, and *recessa*. For *reuma* see Du Cange (s.v. *rheuma*) and Columbani *Ep.* v, ed. Gundlach, *Epistolae*, III (1892), p. 174; *Vita Condedi* ii, ed. Levison, *Script. Rer. Merov.*, V (1910), p. 651; *Vita Vulframni* viii, *ibid.*, p. 667; Beda *De Temporum Ratione* xxix, PL, XC, 423. For *adsissa* (*assisa*) see Isidore *De ordine creaturarum* ix. 5, 7, PL, LXXXIII, 936, 937; the word occurs as a gloss on *dodrans* in a Latin poem published by Thurneysen (*Revue Celtique*, XI (1890), p. 89). *Recessa* is employed by Isidore, *op. cit.*, ix. 7, *assisa sit recessa*.

The following words are not given by Georges: ludificus (pp. 381, 382, 397, 414); ordinaliter (383, 418, 426); oda (393, 396); praememorare (408, 417, 427); endecas (416, 423); iterate (417, 423); solanus (417, 427, 428, 431); decennovalis (420, 421); incarnatio (422, 432); inconfuse (423); titulate (431); ostentum (434, 435, 439); quadrantilis (435, 439).

The following are examples of late and technical words: alternatim, anastassis, anchora (canonica), binarius, bissextilis, bissextus, calculatio, cielus, circumlustrare, codiculus, compotus, congregatim,

¹ On p. 390, l. 23, for crescesque read gregesque; p. 441, l. 21, chias seems wrong.

congrue, connumerare, continuatim, contrarietas, conversim, creatio, decennovennalis, diphthongus, elongare, embolismus, epacta, evangelicus, famen, fulgescere, horoscopus, immobiliter, immutabiliter, incessabilis, indictio, insensatus, metaplasmus, momentum, ogdoas, parasceue, pascha, paschalis, pirus, punctus, quadragesima, quadrivium, recapitulatio, regulare, rotalis, rotella, rotula, saltus (lunaris), septempliciter, sparsim, specialiter, spiritalis, subsequenter, subulcus, tonus, transcensus, trigeni, unarius, veraciter, versificus.

MARIO ESPOSITO

DUBLIN, IRELAND

WALPOLE'S RELATIONS WITH VOLTAIRE¹

A study of the Walpole-Voltaire correspondence is interesting from the historical point of view chiefly because it shows that in 1768—eight years, that is to say, before the notorious letter² which Voltaire wrote to d'Argental on the publication of Letourneur's translation of Shakespeare—the “apostle and martyr of the English” was already repenting of having introduced the “histrion barbare” to French readers in his *Lettres philosophiques*. It shows us too how the dilettante Walpole was willing to “fight to the death for the superiority of Shakespeare,” and reminds us that it was partly toward this end that he produced his *Castle of Otranto*, a novel in which the sublime and the ridiculous were united in supposedly Shakespearean proportions, and the “deportment of the domestics” was based on the gravediggers' scene in *Hamlet*. Further, we can reconstruct by this means the story of the clash between these two kindred spirits, the man of the world dabbling in literature on the one hand, the man of letters posing as a leader of society on the other.

¹ Bibliography:

Correspondance complète de Mme du Deffand avec la Duchesse de Choiseul, l'abbé Barthélemy, et M. Craufurt (ed. le Marquis de Sainte-Aulaire, 3 tom., 1877; orig. ed., 2 tom., 1859; nouv. ed. augm., 1866).

Correspondance complète de la Marquise Du Deffand avec ses amis le Président Hénault, Montesquieu, D'Alembert, Voltaire, Horace Walpole, précédée d'une histoire de sa vie, etc. (ed. M. de Lescure, 2 tom., 1865).

Lettres de la Marquise du Deffand à Horace Walpole, depuis comte d'Orford, écrites dans les années 1766 à 1780; auxquelles sont jointes des lettres de Madame du Deffand à Voltaire, écrites dans les années 1759 à 1775. Publiées d'après les originaux déposés à Strawberry-Hill (nouv. ed., augm. des extraits des lettres d'Horace Walpole, ed. N. T. Artaud, 4 tom., 1824 [this edition is a translation of Miss Berry's edition of 1810]).

Letters of the Marquise Du Deffand to the Hon. Horace Walpole, afterward Earl of Orford, from 1766 to 1780. To which are added Letters of Mme du Deffand to Voltaire from 1759 to 1775. Published from the originals at Strawberry Hill (ed. with a life of the authoress and notes, by Miss Mary Berry, 4 vols., 1810).

Lettres de la Marquise du Deffand à Horace Walpole (1766-1780) (ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee, 3 tom., 1912).

Correspondance littéraire, philosophique, et critique, par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal, Meister, etc. (ed. Tournoux, 1877).

Voltaire, *Œuvres* (ed. Beuchot, 1833 [the letters to Walpole are in Vol. LXV]).

Letters of Horace Walpole, Fourth Earl of Orford (ed. Paget Toynbee, 1891).

The Castle of Otranto, by Horace Walpole (2d ed., with Preface, 1767).

Churton Collins, *Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England* (1908).

² Voltaire to d'Argental, July 19, 1776; this letter is quoted below, p. 199, n. 5.

Voltaire was a "very" great man, Walpole a sufficiently small one; Voltaire was a cosmopolitan, his antagonist as full of insular prejudices as though he had never crossed the Channel; yet in this instance their motives and their methods of controversy are amusingly similar and equally questionable. In the end, circumstances rather than any merit of his own gave Walpole the *beau rôle* and allowed him to write later a summary account,¹ breathing virtuous disgust in every line; yet the quarrel would never have arisen had he not published some remarks on Voltaire as irrelevant as they were personal.

At this period Walpole was very popular in French society. The son of a prime minister whose policy had given France peace, he was also an Englishman in an age of Anglomania, and the owner of a complete Gothic castle in days when few French landscape gardens possessed anything more imposing than a Cave of Melancholy, or at most, like the Duc de Choiseul's park at Chanteloup, a Pagoda of Friendship. And Strawberry Hill contained too the "Officina Arbuteana," volumes from the presses of which were much sought after in Paris. We hear of gifts to Madame Necker, the Duchesse de Choiseul, the Abbé Barthélemy; of a complete set sent at the request of the librarian to the Royal Library itself. Grimm presents Walpole to the sovereigns of Northern Europe as the son of Sir Robert, the wittiest of Englishmen in Paris, the ill-advised printer of the Président Hénault's worthless *Cornélie*, a martyr to the gout, and—most important of all—the author of "la lettre du roi de Prusse à J-J Rousseau, qui a joué un si grand rôle dans la querelle de David Hume."²

It was this letter which won for Walpole an unusual vogue at the moment of its appearance, and caused him a great deal of annoyance

¹ "About the same time Voltaire published in the *Mercure* the letter he had written to me, but I made no answer, because he had treated me more dirtily than Mr. Hume had. Though Voltaire, with whom I had never had the least acquaintance or correspondence, had voluntarily written to me first and asked for my book [*Historic Doubts on Richard III*], he wrote a letter to the Duchess of Choiseul, in which, without saying a syllable of his having written to me first, he told her I had officiously sent him my *Works*, and declared war with him in defence of *ce bouffon Shakespeare*, whom in his reply to me he had pretended so much to admire. The Duchess sent me Voltaire's letter, which gave me such contempt for his disingenuity that I dropped all correspondence with him" (Walpole, *Short Notes of My Life*, April 24, 1769).

² Grimm, *op. cit.*, July 15, 1768. The Président sent Voltaire a copy of this Strawberry Hill edition of *Cornélie* (Mme du Deffand to Voltaire, July 3, 1768; to Walpole, November 9, 1767).

six months later. He wrote it at Paris in January, 1766, by way of ridiculing the affectations of Rousseau, who had just passed through the city with Hume, on his "flight" to England. The persecution to which he imagined he was subjected, and the martyrdom he seemed thirsting to endure, had provoked universal interest, though anything but universal sympathy. Walpole's not very witty *jeu d'esprit*¹ thus made him the fashion for the moment,² and when that fashion showed signs of dying a natural death it was revived by the quarrel between Rousseau and Hume, which, thanks to Grimm's *Correspondance*, Suard's *Exposé*, Hume's *Concise and Genuine Account*, Walpole's *Narrative*, and countless other pamphlets, prevented Voltaire, like the rest of Europe, from not knowing the name of Hume's "accomplice."³

It is thus not at all surprising that Voltaire should have wished to know more of the Englishman who had been teasing one of the blackest of his *bêtes noires*. He was too a genuinely devoted friend of Walpole's correspondent, Mme du Deffand; he owed to her relative Choiseul, another of Walpole's admirers, the prosperity of his manufactures at Ferney; he seems to have met Sir Robert during his stay in England (1726-29); his relations with the circle of Grimm and D'Alembert suggest that he knew most of what went

¹ *Le Roi de Prusse à Monsieur Rousseau*.

"MON CHER JEAN-JACQUES,

"Vous avez renoncé à Genève votre patrie; vous vous êtes fait chasser de la Suisse, pays tant vanté dans vos écrits; la France vous a décrété. Venez donc chez moi; j'admire vos talens; je m'amuse de vos rêveries, qui (soit dit en passant) vous occupent trop, et trop long tems. Il faut à la fin être sage et heureux. Vous avez assez fait parler de vous par des singularités peu convenables à un véritable grand homme. Démonstrez à vos ennemis que vous pouvez avoir quelquefois le sens commun: cela les fâchera, sans vous faire tort. Mes états vous offrent une retraite paisible; je vous veux du bien, et je vous en ferai, si vous le trouvez bon. Mais si vous vous obstinez à rejeter mon secours, attendez-vous que je ne le dirai à personne. Si vous persistez à vous creuser l'esprit pour trouver de nouveaux malheurs, choisissez-les tels que vous voudrez. Je suis roi, je puis vous en procurer au gré de vos souhaits: et ce qui sûrement ne vous arrivera pas vis à vis de vos ennemis, je cesserai de vous persécuter quand vous cesserez de mettre votre gloire à l'être.

"Votre bon ami,

"FRÉDÉRIC"

² See his letters to Conway, January 12, 1766; Chute, January 15, 1766; Gray, January 25, 1766.

³ A full account of the dispute appears in Churton Collins, *op. cit.*, pp. 217-41. Walpole's letters to Hume (July 26, November 1 and 11, 1766) show him adopting, as he did in his *Narrative*, an attitude of well-bred contempt for all mere scribblers and *philosophes*; he cannot, however, conceal his annoyance at D'Alembert's having been offended that Rousseau should have attributed the letter of the King of Prussia to himself (D'Alembert).

into the *Correspondance littéraire*. The pretext on which he addressed Walpole we know; as to the motive we can hazard a plausible guess. He writes then to congratulate the author of the *Historic Doubts on Richard III* on having adopted an attitude of skepticism in treating of his subject—an attitude which he, Voltaire, has long been preaching as the only safe one for the historian to adopt.¹ Perhaps Walpole will be so kind as to send him a copy of the book itself, though the only claim he can urge is his desire to instruct himself further.

So far so good; but in 1767 there had appeared a French translation of *The Castle of Otranto*, a poor one according to Walpole,² though Grimm³ praises the elegance and correctness of the translator, *l'infatigable M. Eidous*—*le fatal M. Eidous*, as he calls him in less flattering vein elsewhere. Grimm hardly knew what to make of the story itself; he found it difficult to admire, but succeeded in explaining the fact away with the one reflection which of all others was most calculated to rouse the wrath of the lord of Ferney—"il ne faut pas juger les ouvrages de M. Walpole comme ceux d'un écrivain de profession, mais comme des objets d'amusement et de délassement d'un homme de qualité." Even a philosopher, he continues, could not but shudder at the monstrous helmet, the giant sword, the walking picture, the hermit's skeleton, though "il est vrai que, quand on a lu cela, il n'en résulte pas grand'chose."⁴

It was from the Preface attached to the second edition that great things did result, as both Grimm and Mme du Deffand had from the beginning prophesied that they would.⁵ Walpole replied to his old friend's remonstrances with a warm defense of his *Castle*—"de

¹ "Il y a cinquante ans, que j'ai fait vœu de douter. J'ose vous supplier, Monsieur, de m'aider à accomplir mon vœu! Je vous suis peut-être inconnu, quoique j'aie été honoré autrefois de l'amitié of the too brother [i.e., of Sir Robert and his brother old Horace]" (Voltaire to Walpole, June 6, 1768).

² *Short Notes of My Life* (March, 1767).

³ Grimm, *op. cit.*, letter of February 15, 1767.

⁴ The British Museum copy of the second edition has pasted inside the cover a cutting from the *St. James' Chronicle*, which gives the English view—a piece of verse to the author signed "Philotrantus." The second stanza runs:

"By thee decoy'd, with curious Fear
We tread thy *Castle's* dreary Round;
Though horrid all we see and hear,
Thy Horrors charm while they confound."

⁵ "J'aurais voulu qu'on eût supprimé la préface ... il y est lu que Shakespeare a beaucoup plus d'esprit que Voltaire; ce trait vous met à l'abri de la critique de Fréron, mais ne peut manquer de vous en attirer bien d'autres" (Mme du Deffand to Walpole, March 8, 1767).

tous mes ouvrages ... l'unique où je me sois plu"—which will, he is convinced, find admirers enough when the reign of taste shall supersede that of philosophy. As for Voltaire, he seeks no quarrel with him, but he will maintain to the death the superiority of Shakespeare.¹

A study of the Preface itself hardly bears out these pacific assurances. Walpole begins by explaining that his novel was "an attempt to blend the two kinds of Romance, the ancient and the modern. . . . My rule was Nature. . . . That great master of nature, *Shakespeare*, was the model I copied." It is from the speeches of the gravediggers in *Hamlet*, the rough jests of the citizens in *Julius Caesar* that he has learned how a contrast between the sublimity of the heroes and the naïveté of the servants will enhance the effect of the whole. But—and we feel at once how forced is the transition and how unnecessary the reference—Voltaire declares, in his edition of Corneille, that this mixture of buffoonery and solemnity is intolerable; well, "Voltaire is a genius—but not of Shakespeare's magnitude." To refute him, Walpole will appeal to his own opinions, expressed when he was speaking without prejudice. In the Preface to the *Enfant Prodigue* ("that exquisite piece of which I declare my admiration, and which, should I live twenty years longer, I trust I shall never attempt to ridicule"²), he says of comedy: "On y voit un mélange de sérieux et de plaisanterie"; and surely this must apply to tragedy equally well. Again, "in his epistle to Maffei, prefixed to *Mélope*, he delivers almost the same opinion, though I doubt not with a little irony."

This, though unnecessary, is not offensive; we may wonder what Voltaire is doing in this galley, but, renouncing the attempt to discover how he came there, we must agree that his captor has treated him with all due courtesy. Not so in the footnotes, however; Walpole's pages, like Gibbon's, carry their sting in their tail. "The following remark," he has the grace to admit, "is foreign to the present

¹ This reply to Mme du Deffand's letter of March 8 is quoted by Miss Berry in a note to her edition of the *Letters of Mme du Deffand*. Walpole, afraid of the publication of his letters to Mme du Deffand, had insisted on her returning or destroying them; she burned many in 1778; the rest she had sent to England by Conway in 1775. These last were apparently destroyed by Miss Berry in accordance with Walpole's will.

² This is a hit at Voltaire's change of opinion over Shakespeare. "The French critic has twice translated the same speech ['To be or not to be'] from *Hamlet*, some years ago in admiration, latterly in derision; and I am sorry to find that his judgment grows weaker, when it ought to be farther matured."

question"—but this does not prevent him from making it. May not "the severe criticisms of so masterly a writer as *Voltaire* on our immortal countryman" have been "the effusions of wit and precipitation, rather than the result of judgment and attention? May not the critic's skill in the force and powers of our language have been as incorrect and incompetent as his knowledge of our history? Of the latter his own pen has dropped glaring evidence."¹ Walpole too, we see, could on occasion be "a venomous insect."

Such was the Preface. It seems difficult to believe that *Voltaire* had not heard of it; *Mme du Deffand's* circle, which included many of his correspondents, was discussing it with dismay, *Grimm* had called special attention to it in reviewing *Eidous'* translation, and, even supposing that his dearest friends had preferred not to hurt his feelings by referring to it, his dearest enemies, and they were many, were no doubt enchanted to repair the omission. What more natural than that *Voltaire*, ever quick to resent a fancied insult, much more such a real one as the Preface contained, should have used his slight though perhaps genuine interest in *Richard III* as a pretext for joining battle with its author about this later work?

Whatever *Voltaire's* motive in writing the letter on *Richard III*, we may imagine the very mixed feelings with which *Walpole* received it. His reply² is certainly a masterpiece of tact, even down to the delicate flattery implied by his writing it in English, not to mention many compliments of a more direct and even fulsome nature.

Without knowing it, you have been my master, and perhaps the sole merit in my writings is owing to my having studied yours; so far, Sir, am I from living in that state of barbarism and ignorance with which you tax me when you say *que vous m'êtes peut-être inconnu*. I was not a stranger to your reputation very many years ago, but remember to have then thought you honoured our house by dining with our mother—though I was at school, and had not the happiness of seeing you.

Then, after more general remarks, comes his confession; in the Preface to "a trifling romance, much unworthy of [his] regard," he has found fault with some of *Voltaire's* remarks on *Shakespeare*.

¹ The "evidence" could not well be more trivial. In his Preface to *Thomas Corneille's Essex*, *Voltaire* shows that he does not realize that the Earl of Leicester and *Dudley* were the same person.

² June 21, 1768.

This romance he now proposes to send, and very cleverly does he adopt the pose of the bluff and magnanimous Briton in doing so.

I might retract, I might beg your pardon; but having said nothing but what I thought, nothing illiberal or unbecoming a gentleman, it would be treating you with ingratitude and impertinence, to suppose that you would either be offended with my remarks, or pleased with my recantation. You are as much above wanting flattery, as I am above offering it to you.

By the same courier, Walpole wrote in much perplexity to Mme du Deffand. His letter is of course lost, but we can judge of its contents by the reply.¹ No, says his mentor, he was right in not speaking of his part in the Hume-Rousseau affair;² and yes, he was right in confessing to the Preface: "Je viens de me la faire relire, elle est terrible; il n'est pas vraisemblable qu'il l'ignore; mais s'il l'ignorait, il l'apprendrait un jour, et en ce cas il est bon de le prévenir: il y a de la noblesse et de la franchise dans ce procédé." But, adds this shrewd old tactician, having confessed that the Preface exists, why force Voltaire to read it? Why not quietly forget to send it? Above all, why run the risk of entering upon an interminable literary quarrel?³ She wrote too to Mme de Choiseul at Chanteloup, asking advice and sending copies of the letters, seeking thus to enlist a powerful ally in the coming dispute.⁴

Voltaire's reply, an *Art poétique* in little, was written on July 15. He praises *Richard III*,⁵ but devotes most of his attention to the questions raised in the Preface, though he nowhere mentions it by name and only in one or two instances replies to it point by point.

¹ Letter of June 28, 1768.

² Voltaire already knew of it from D'Alembert, who wrote on August 11, 1766.

³ "Il me vient à l'esprit que, n'ayant rien à faire, il ne serait pas fâché de vous attirer à une correspondance littéraire, qui se tournerait en discussion, en dispute, et lui donnerait l'occasion de se venger de vous. Vous avez décidé que Shakespeare avait plus d'esprit que lui: croyez-vous qu'il le pardonne? C'est tout ce que je peux faire, moi, de vous le pardonner."

⁴ "Je trouve la franchise de M. Walpole envers Voltaire extrêmement noble. ... mais pourquoi me dites-vous: *Ne vous détachez pas de notre ami*? Vous savez combien je suis disposée à aimer tous ceux qui vous aiment, et celui-là plus qu'aucun autre, parce que son personnel me plaît infiniment et que j'ai très-bonne opinion de son cœur et de son âme" (Mme de Choiseul to Mme du Deffand, July 6, 1768).

⁵ "Vous seriez un excellent *attorney-general*. Vous pesez toutes les probabilités; mais il paraît que vous avez une inclination secrète pour ce bossu. ... Je veux croire avec vous que Richard III n'était ni si laid ni si méchant qu'on le dit; mais je n'aurais pas voulu avoir affaire à lui. Votre *rose blanche* et votre *rose rouge* avaient de terribles épines pour la nation."

Walpole, he not unreasonably complains, has tried to make the English believe that he despises Shakespeare:

Je suis le premier qui aie fait connaître Shakespeare aux Français. ... J'ai été persécuté pendant trente ans par une nuée de fanatiques, pour avoir dit que Locke est l'Hercule de la métaphysique. ... Ma destinée a encore voulu que je fusse le premier qui aie expliqué à mes concitoyens les découvertes du grand Newton. ... J'ai été votre apôtre et votre martyr; en vérité il n'est pas juste que les Anglais se plaignent de moi.

For many years, he protests, he has been maintaining that Shakespeare's genius was his own, while his faults were those of his period—"c'est le chaos de la tragédie, dans lequel il y a cent traits de lumière." He admits that he has advocated, as Walpole declares, a mixture of the serious and the comic in comedy; even that he has said that "tous les genres sont bons, hors le genre ennuyeux." Granted: "mais la grossièreté n'est pas un genre," and this even the Spaniards are beginning to see. As to the unities, "vous n'observez, vous autres libres Bretons, ni unité de lieu, ni unité de temps, ni unité d'action"—and the plays which result are none the better for it.

Walpole had attacked in his Preface the occasional flatness of the style of Racine; Voltaire broadens the question by the sweeping nature of his reply. Paris, he declares, is far superior to Athens for comedy and tragedy alike: in the former, Molière and even Regnard have surpassed Aristophanes, while "toutes les tragédies grecques me paraissent des ouvrages d'écoliers, en comparaison des sublimes scènes de Corneille, et des parfaites tragédies de Racine." And the standard of taste is higher in Paris than at Athens; there the theater-going public never exceeded ten thousand, and that including the lower classes; here, above thirty thousand souls, all of them men and women of culture, delight in the works of our great masters.

Walpole's last stricture had dealt with the French use of rhyme; but, says Voltaire, Dryden used it, so why not Corneille and Racine? "C'est une difficulté de plus." And he settles or evades the whole question with one of those anecdotes that are true to life if not to fact:

Je demandais un jour à Pope pourquoi Milton n'avait pas rimé son poème, dans le temps que les autres poètes rimaient leurs poèmes, à l'imitation des Italiens; il me répondit: *Because he could not*.

And so, with a graceful compliment that ought to have made the conscience-stricken Walpole wish he had never mentioned those twin brethren, the Earl of Leicester and Dudley, the letter ends.

But now for the *tracasserie* that one comes to regard as almost inevitable in Voltaire's "little wars." He is evidently out to make mischief or at least to make a noise; accordingly, instead of sending his letter direct to Walpole, he sends it to Mme de Choiseul, who will pass it on to Mme du Deffand, who will finally send it to England—at every stage in its journey, then, it will be read, admired, discussed; and Voltaire sees in the discussion the germs of a very pretty little international dispute. To make assurance doubly sure, he sends Mme de Choiseul his own version of the affair,¹ not knowing, one imagines, that she had already been shown all the pieces of evidence by Mme du Deffand. It certainly cannot have occurred to him that she would take the drastic course of sending Walpole his letter to her, together with the long, full-dress letter it had covered.

There can be no doubt now, writes Mme du Deffand,² as to the intentions of Voltaire, and she repeats the advice she had given a month before.

Au nom de Dieu, ne donnez point dans ce panneau; tirez-vous de cette affaire le plus poliment qu'il vous sera possible, mais évitez la guerre; c'est le sentiment et le conseil de la grand' maman [Mme de Choiseul]; c'est celui du grand abbé [Barthélemy], et par-dessus tout, c'est le mien; je suis bien sûre aussi que ce sera le vôtre.

It was; the Choiseul letter shocked Walpole as much as his friends had anticipated—all the more, no doubt, because he himself had not found it easy to be straightforward with this treacherous antagonist.³

¹ "MADAME,

"La femme du protecteur est protectrice. La femme du ministre de la France pourra prendre le parti des Français contre les Anglais avec qui je suis en guerre. Daignez juger, Madame, entre M. Walpole et moi. Il m'a envoyé ses ouvrages dans lesquels il justifie le tyran Richard trois, dont ni vous ni moi ne nous soucions guère. Mais il donne la préférence à son grossier bouffon de Shakespeare sur Racine et sur Corneille, et c'est de quoi je me soucie beaucoup.

"Je ne sais par quelle voie M. Walpole m'a envoyé sa déclaration de guerre. Il faut que ce soit par M. le Duc de Choiseul, car elle est très-spirituelle et très-polie. Si vous voulez, Madame, être médiatrice de la paix, il ne tient qu'à vous; j'en passerai par ce que vous ordonnerez; je vous supplie d'être juge du combat. ...

"Vous me trouverez bien hardi, mais vous pardonnerez à un vieux soldat qui combat pour sa patrie, et qui, s'il a du goût, aura combattu sous vos ordres."

² Letter of July 21, 1768.

³ Walpole's reply to Mme du Deffand's letter of July 21, quoted by Miss Berry, says: "Vous voyez la bonne foi de cet homme-là! Il me recherche, il me demande mon *Richard*, et puis il parle comme si je m'étais intrigué à le lui faire lire. Sa vanité est blessée de ce qu'on a osé lui donner un rival, et il a la faiblesse plus grande encore de vouloir le rejeter sur la part qu'il prend à l'honneur de Corneille et de Racine."

Accordingly he replies in a tone of ironical and overwhelming politeness, thanking Voltaire for his letter, but declining further controversy.

One can never, Sir, be sorry to have been in the wrong, when one's errors are pointed out to one in so obliging and masterly a manner. Whatever opinion I may have of Shakespeare, I should think him to blame, if he could have seen the letter you have done me the honour to write to me, and yet not conform to the rules you have there laid down. When he lived, there had not been a Voltaire both to give laws to the stage, and to show on what good sense those laws were founded. . . . But I will say no more on this head; for I am neither so unpolished as to tell you to your face how much I admire you, nor, though I have taken the liberty to vindicate Shakespeare against your criticisms, am I vain enough to think myself an adversary worthy of you. I am more proud of receiving laws from you than of contesting them.¹

With his letter to Mme de Choiseul, Voltaire had even worse luck. She sent no direct reply at all,² and it was left for Mme du Deffand to try to patch up a peace in which neither she herself nor any of those concerned believed.

Though she had agreed with Walpole in condemning Voltaire's letter to Mme de Choiseul, she had enthusiastically praised the letter to Walpole himself,³ and had refused to commit herself as to the rights of the case beyond temporizing with, "Tout ce que je sais, c'est que Voltaire a raison et que vous n'avez pas tort."⁴ Thus it was that when the Maréchale de Luxembourg sent her a complete set of Voltaire's new quarto edition she was able to reply with not more than the average amount of insincerity, praising the answer to the Preface as "a masterpiece of taste, good sense, wit, eloquence, politeness, etc." But she was improvising rather too freely when she continued:

M. de Walpole est bien converti: il faut lui pardonner ses erreurs passées. L'orgueil national est grand dans les Anglais; ils ont de la peine à nous

¹ Letter of July 27, 1768.

² "Je crois que nous ferons bien de le laisser tranquille, car pour moi, je ne veux point entrer dans une dispute littéraire. Je ne me sens pas en état de tenir tête à Voltaire, puis l'animadversion des gens de lettres me paraît la plus dangereuse des postes" (Mme de Choiseul to Mme du Deffand, August 7, 1768). Cf. Mme du Deffand's letter to Walpole, July 27, 1768, which speaks of "la réponse indirecte qu'elle lui avait faite en m'écrivant."

³ "C'est le dieu du style" (letter to Walpole of August 10, 1768).

⁴ Letter to Walpole of August 23, 1768.

accorder la supériorité dans les choses de goût, tandis que sans vous nous reconnaitrions en eux toute supériorité dans les choses de raisonnement.¹

So far from Walpole's being converted, this very letter—one of those brought to Strawberry Hill after Mme du Deffand's death in 1780—bears a pencil note in his own hand to contradict this statement, and adding that had he known he would certainly not have allowed his well-meaning old friend to make it.

Mme du Deffand was, however, knocking at an open door. On this occasion at least Voltaire seems to have borne no malice, possibly because he was fully occupied at the moment by a very similar feud with the Président Hénault.² Like a true philosopher, he turned the affair to practical use, and quotes the *Historic Doubts* in two of his works.³

Walpole took things more seriously: he could forgive neither Voltaire's criticism of Shakespeare nor Voltaire's conduct toward himself. Accordingly, when Lady Ossory sent him a copy of one of these "honourable mentions," we find him coldly replying:

I saw long ago the passage your Ladyship took the trouble to transcribe. To be cited so honourably by Voltaire would be flattering indeed, if he had not out of envy taken pains to depreciate all the really great authors of his own country, and of this; and what sort of judgment is that which decries Shakespeare and commends me?⁴

His indignation on reading Voltaire's letter to d'Argental⁵ on Letourneur's Shakespeare was extreme; he sends to Mason this "paltry

¹ Letter to Voltaire of August 14, 1768.

² Mme du Deffand to Walpole, October 5, 1768; Voltaire to Mme du Deffand, January 4, 1769.

³ He says in his Preface to *Don Pèdre* (a tragedy finished in 1774, though begun much earlier, in which he takes the part of Pedro the Cruel of Castile against Henry of Trastámara): "Il ne faut pas s'étonner après cela si les historiens ont pris le parti du vainqueur contre le vaincu. Ceux qui ont écrit l'histoire en Espagne et en France n'ont pas été des Tacites; et M. Horace Walpole, envoyé d'Angleterre en Espagne [he is confusing the "noble author" with his uncle Horace, Lord Walpole] a eu bien raison de dire dans ses *Doutes sur Richard III*, comme nous l'avons remarqué ailleurs: 'Quand un roi heureux accuse ses ennemis, tous les historiens s'empressent de lui servir de témoins.'" Voltaire quotes the same maxim in *Le Pyrrhonisme dans l'histoire*, chap. xvii (1768). In his *Essai sur les mœurs* (definitive edition, 1756), he had already mentioned "l'ingénieux M. Walpole" when giving his account of the Wars of the Roses, in chaps. cxvi and cxvii.

⁴ Letter to Lady Ossory, January 7, 1777.

⁵ "Auriez-vous lu deux volumes misérables dans lesquels il [Letourneur] veut faire regarder Shakespeare comme le seul modèle de la véritable tragédie? Il l'appelle le Dieu du Théâtre ... il ne daigne pas nommer Corneille ou Racine: ces deux grands hommes sont seulement enveloppés dans la proscription générale sans que leurs noms soient prononcés. Il y a déjà deux tomes d'imprimés de ce Shakespeare, qu'on prendrait pour des pièces de la Foire, faites il y a deux cents ans. ... Ce qu'il y a d'affreux, c'est que le monstre a un parti en France, et pour comble de calamités, et d'horreur, c'est moi qui autrefois parlai le premier de ce Shakespeare; c'est moi qui le premier montraux Français quelques perles que j'avais trouvées dans son énorme fumier, etc." (letter of July 19, 1776).

scurrilous letter against Shakespeare, but it is not worth sending"; and explains: "I have a mind to provoke you, and so I send you this silly torrent of ribaldry. May the spirit of Pope that dictated your 'Musæus,' animate you to punish this worst of dunces, a genius turned fool with envy."¹

The last of his references to Voltaire shows him still mindful of the ancient grudge:

I . . . was much pleased with the sight of both the letters of Voltaire and Mr. Windham. . . . Both are curious in different ways. Voltaire's English would be good English in any other foreigner; but a man who gave himself the air of criticising our—and I will say the world's—greatest author, ought to have been a better master of our language, though this letter and his commentary prove that he could neither write it nor read it accurately and intelligently.²

M. B. FINCH
E. ALLISON PEERS

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

¹ Letter to Mason, September 17, 1776.

² Letter to Warton, December 9, 1784.

THE GRAIL AND THE ENGLISH "SIR PERCEVAL"

XI

Three Irish stories about "Finn and the Goblin" have been in print for some years, but have never before been brought into connection with *Sir Perceval* (*Sp*).¹ The oldest and rudest of these exists in eighth-century Irish, and is called "Finn and the Man in the Tree".²

When the *Fiana* were at Badamair on the brink of the Suir, Cúldub the son of Ua Birgge (Cúldub mac húi Birgge) came out of the *síd* (fairy-knoll) on the plain of Femen (ut Scotti dicunt) and carried off their cooking from them. For three nights he did thus to them. The third time however Finn knew and went before him [the goblin] to the fairy-knoll on Femen. Finn laid hold of him as he went into the knoll, so that he fell.

A fairy woman jammed Finn's finger between the door and post at the entrance of the knoll.

Another form of the story belongs to the ninth century and is called "How Finn Obtained Knowledge and the Death of the Fairy Cúldub".³

Every morning a man was told off to boil a pig for his [Finn's] day's food. Now once Oisín was told off to boil it. When he deemed it done, he passed it on the points of the fork over the litter into the hand of his comrade. Then something clutched at it. It passed out. He ran after it (the goblin) across the Suir, to wit, at Ath Nemthenn, across Ord, across Inmain, across the Slope of the Uí Faelain up to the summit of the Fairy Knoll on Femen plain. The door was shut after it when it had gone into the fairy-knoll, and Oisín was left outside. When the *Fiana* awoke, then Oisín came. "Where is the pig?" said Finn. "Some one braver than I has taken it," said Oisín.

On the next day Cailte took it. It was carried from him in the same manner. However, he came (back). "Where is the pig?" said Finn. "I am not braver than he from whom it was taken yesterday," said Cailte.

¹ The *Acallam* episode was mentioned by me in "The Bleeding Lance," *PMLA*, XXV (1910), p. 4.

² Edited and translated by Kuno Meyer, *Rev. Celt.*, XXV (1904), 344 f. On the date see Meyer, *Fianaigecht*, *RIA*, *Todd Lec. Series*, XVI (1910), p. xviii.

³ *Ibid.*, XIV (1893), 245 f. On the date see *Fianaigecht*, p. xix.

"Who is to go now to boil it?" said Finn. "The younger thorn is always the sharper." He went himself to boil it, his spear hafts in his left hand, his other hand turning the pig on the points of the fork. Something clutched at it. Finn gave it (the goblin) a blow, but the point of his lance only reached its back. However, it left its load outside. It went into Ely, into Cell Ichtair Lethet. . . . Seven times it jumped across the Suir. . . . He made a thrust at it as it was going into the fairy-knoll so that thereby he broke its back. Finn stretched out his hand at the doorpost of the fairy-knoll (*síd*), so that the door was closed on his thumb. He put it into his mouth, and heard their wail. "What is that?" they all said. "Cúldub has been killed!" "Who killed him?" said they. "Finn O'Baisene." They all wail.

These Irish stories are identical in their main features. In both, Finn's company is injured by a goblin on successive occasions; in both, Finn pursues the goblin and slays or fells him just as he is entering the door of a fairy-knoll.

It appears that folk-tales were not written down by ancient Irish scribes (or if written down were not preserved) unless they were fitted into the history (or pseudo-history) of Ireland. It is Finn's great name that has preserved the stories just outlined, and doubtless the special reason why they were written down was because in the accident at the door of the knoll¹ they supplied a reason for Finn's well-known gift of foretelling the future by chewing his thumb.

These stories are mnemonic outlines intended to be filled out by the memory of the narrator. The tale of a spook, who, like the harpies of classic story, carries off your dinner, is certainly older than the eighth century, and was at first a floating bit of folk-lore ready to be attached to any hero. It accords with immemorial fairy belief still current in Celtic lands. Enchantment is not mentioned in either story, but the underlying idea is doubtless that Finn's company was enchanted by a hostile fairy just as in recently collected tales about cows that give no milk until malevolent fairies are sub-

¹ *Rev. Celt.*, XXV, 349. A more usual explanation attributes the power to Finn's having tasted the salmon of wisdom, *Macgnímartha Finn* (§ 18) (quoted below). References to this miraculous gift abound in Finn stories: *Cormac's Glossary*, s.v. *Orc Tréith*; *Fianaiagecht*, p. xix; *Rev. Celt.*, XIII, 16, 21; Stokes, *Festschrift*, p. 10; *Síleá Gadelica*, II, 98, 106, 135, 147, 163, 168-69, 233, 247; *Irische Texte*, IV, 248 (cf. Stokes's note, p. 288, l. 1834); MacDougall, *Folk and Hero Tales from Argyllshire* (1891), pp. 58, 274.

This gift, which is mentioned in the oldest accounts, is a valuable bit of evidence that Finn either was or became a *märchen* hero. The *märchen* formulas that resemble the Finn story ("Aryan Expulsion and Return," "Fated-Prince," usually, Woods, *PMLA*, XXVII, 527-30) ("Bärensohn," always, Panzer, *Studien zur Germ. Sagen-geschichte*, I [1910], 3) ascribe supernatural gifts to the hero.

duced.¹ Probably only a destined hero armed with a magic spear could break the enchantment. A tenth-century Irish poem informs us that Cúldub was slain by Finn with Fiaccail's spear.²

What appears to be a pre-Finn form of the tale of "Finn and the Goblin" is told both in the prose *Dindshenchas*, a collection which did not take shape until the twelfth century,³ but which bristles with

¹ For example in S. Morrison, "The Silver Cup" in *Manx Fairy Tales* (1911), pp. 27 f., we read of a herd that gave no milk until their owner ended the enchantment by breaking into a fairy-knoll and stealing thence a silver cup. Cf. J. Curtin, *Tales of the Fairies* (1895), pp. 19 f.; Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West-Highlands*, II (1890), 47. A kindred idea is that of a demon who spoils your feast. This occurs in Panzer's "Bärensohn" formula, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-83 f., where snatching, defiling, or spitting demons are collected. A spitting demon who spoils a meal occurs in a North Carolina negro tale printed by Elsie Parsons, *JAF*, XXX (1917), 179; cf. 186. An extraordinarily vivid tale where a cat is the aggressor is given by Thos. Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, Part I (1860), 112 f., *Chetham Society*, from a pamphlet printed in 1584. Another kindred idea is that of the demon hand; see Kittredge, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, VIII, 227-30. Haunted houses may be compared; see C. Mackay, *Memoirs of Extraordinary Delusions*, II (1841), 367; J. H. Ingram, *The Haunted Homes and Family Traditions of Great Britain* (1888); A. Lang, *Book of Dreams and Ghosts* (1897), pp. 187 f.; J. Ashton, *The Devil in Britain and America* (1896), p. 47; C. Crowe, *The Night-Side of Nature* (1850), p. 273; H. L. Neligan, *True Irish Ghost Stories* (1914); Kittredge, "The Friar's Lantern," *PMLA*, XV (1900), 435 f., and cf. C. H. Bompas, *Folk-Lore of the Santal-Parganas* (1909), p. 381. (Many of these references are due to the kindness of Professor T. P. Cross.) Cf. the idea of a meadow eaten down yearly on St. John's Day by supernatural beings, Dasent, *Popular Tales* (1859), p. 78. This is a variety of what Woods (*PMLA*, XXVII, 553) called "The Periodic Difficulty Theme." *The Battle of Mag Mucrime*, ed. Stokes, from *LL, Rev. Celt.*, XIII, 435 f., tells how King Ailill killed fairies that destroyed his grass and put his men to sleep with their magic song.

² The text is printed in *Fianaigecht*, p. xxiii, and a translation by Meyer in MacInnes, *Folk and Hero Tales* (1890), notes, p. 405:

"Aed MacFidaig fell by the hand of Find,
From the spear of Fiaccail Mac Conchenn,
For the love he gave to the maiden of Bri Elle.
By the same spear Find killed
Cúldub Mac Fidaig Forfind."

³ On the date see *Fianaigecht*, p. xxvii. The story called *Méin Gae Glais* is No. 14 in the Rennes MS, and has been printed and translated by Stokes in *Rev. Celt.*, XV (1894), 305-6:

"Gae Glas son of Luinde son of Lug Liamna was Fiacha Srabhtine's champion. 'Tis for him that the smith (*goba*) made the intractable spear. From the south Cúldub son of Dian went on the day of Hallowe'en (*samain*) to seek to slay some one, and he slew Fídrad son of Dam Dub, from whom *Ardrídrad* is called. Then Gae Glas went a-following him and hurled at him the lance which the smith had made for him by magic, and it passed through Cúldub into the bog, and that lance was never found afterwards save once, when Mael-Odrán son of Dimma Cron, after he had been a year in the ground, found it and slew therewith Aithechdae king of Húi Máil. . . . This lance was the Carr of Belach Duirgen: 'tis it that would slay thirty bands. Thus it was with a fork under its neck, and none save the Devil would move it. So long as the lance is with its point southwards the strength of Conn's Half of Ireland will not be broken by Leinster."

The "Death of Maelodrán" here referred to has been edited by Meyer, *Anec. Oz.*, VIII, Med. and Mod. Series, *Hibernica Minora* (1894), 78-81. It indicates that a demon was thought to dwell in the spear. This spear, because it is handed down as a talisman and given a name "Carr," resembles the spear of Lug, which is often mentioned in Irish stories and has a name "Luin." See my "Bleeding Lance," *PMLA*, XXV, 18, 24, 56.

older material, and in the verse *Dindshenchas*.¹ The hero is Grey Spear (*Gae Glas*), and he slays Cúldub with a cast of a spear in revenge for a wrong, just as Finn slew Cúldub in the stories already outlined. Both here and in the later and fuller account of "Finn and the Goblin," to be quoted presently from the *Acallam*, the spear is a magic weapon. In both the deed was done on Hallowe'en. It can hardly be fortuitous that in this story Fiacha Srabtime is the patron of the hero, while in the *Acallam* Fiacha mac Congha plays a similar part. Manifestly this story of *Gae Glas* is a variant of "Finn and the Goblin." The essential elements are the slaying of a supernatural foe by a magic spear.

A more complete form of the story of "Finn and the Goblin" is told in the *Acallam na Senórach*. Since this collection of tales exists in no MS older than the fifteenth century, it is necessary to consider what evidence attests the existence in the twelfth century of the tale in question.²

This evidence is, first, a precise mention of this *Acallam* in the twelfth-century prose *Dindshenchas*, which establishes the existence of at least some portion of the work at that time; and, second, some verses in the twelfth-century poem³ of Gilla in Chomded, which allude to the very story in question.

The passage in the *Dindshenchas* is as follows:⁴ "As Caelte sang . . . in Patrick's time for their diverse, marvellous *Acallam* (colloquy), which they made on Ireland's topographical legends." In the *Acallam*, as we know it, Oisín and Caelte are the sole survivors of the *Fiana*, and Caelte, just as the *Dindshenchas* declares, is the principal narrator. He goes about Ireland with Patrick and tells stories connected with the localities which they visit. The adjectives "diverse" and "marvellous" fit exactly the extant medley of wild and supernatural stories which Caelte tells. Additions were

¹ Gwynn, *Metrical Dindshenchas*, "Royal Irish Academy, Todd Lecture Series," IX (1906), 64-65. The story agrees with that in the prose except that the smith who made the spear is given a name, "Aith."

² The *Acallam na Senórach*, or "Colloquy with the Ancients," may not have been put into final form before the thirteenth or fourteenth century (see Meyer, *Fianaigeacht*, pp. xxx-xxxi), but there is no reason to think that it shows any traces of influence coming from French romance.

³ The poem is in *LL*, p. 144b, a MS older than 1150. It has been edited and translated by Meyer, *Fianaigeacht*, pp. 46-51.

⁴ Ed. Stokes, *Rev. Celt.*, XV, 437-38, 45.

from time to time thrust into the main framework,¹ but it is incredible that the writer of these lines in the *Dindshenchas* did not know at least some portion of the work which we now have.

The verses of Gilla in Chomded are as follows: "In the eighth year of his (Finn's) life, when he was visiting Dathi's Tara, he slew [Aillén]² whose hand was full with candle . . . with *timpán*. 'A *timpán* for sleep' say all, the practice at each Hallowe'en, a customary deed; every year, lasting incitement, the candle was burning brightly."

The statements of these verses agree, as will be seen, exactly with the details given in the *Acallam*.³ Both describe the incident as Finn's first significant exploit, and locate it at Tara. Both ascribe to an uncanny foe the two powers of fire and of music, and use the same word for the musical instrument: the *timpán*, which in both charms men to sleep. Both relate that this foe made visits at every Hallowe'en. No one can doubt that Gilla in Chomded knew the episode of "Finn and the Goblin" substantially as we have it. "Finn and the Goblin," therefore, belongs to the oldest portion of the *Acallam* and existed in the twelfth century. The reader will observe that the story centers round a talismanic spear which resembles the Luin, a fairy weapon famous in Irish tradition. An outline of the episode is as follows:⁴

(Cáelte is speaking to Ilbrecc.) "That is the spear of Fiacha mac Congha by means of which it was that at the first Finn son of Cumall acquired chief command of Ireland's *Fiana*; and out of Finnachaidh's green-grassed *síd* 'twas brought. For it was Aillén mac Midhna of the Tuatha dé Danaan that out of Carn Finnachaidh to the northward used to come to Tara: the manner of his coming being with a musical *timpán* in his hand, the which whenever any heard he would

¹ See Stokes, *Irish Texts*, IV, x-xli. Dr. Douglas Hyde has found "a second equally long *Acallam* of different contents," *Fianaigeacht*, p. xxxi. I have not been able to examine this.

² The name of the goblin is missing from the MS, but has been supplied by Meyer from the *Acallam*. The context makes a reference to the story of "Finn and the Goblin" certain. See Meyer, *Fianaigeacht*, pp. 46-51.

³ The sole discrepancy is of no importance. According to the poem, at the time of the adventure Finn was eight years old; according to the *Acallam* he was ten.

⁴ O'Grady's translation, *Silva Gadelica*, II, 142-44, corrected according to Stokes's notes, *Irish Texts*, IV, 1 (1900), 287-88. Stokes edits the Irish text from four MSS, pp. 47-50, II. 1654-1771.

at once sleep." Every year on Hallowe'en (*samhain*) the fairy or goblin used to come, lull everyone to sleep with his *timpán*, and then emit a blast of fire out of his mouth. "With his breath he used to blow up the flame and so, during a three-and-twenty years' spell, yearly burnt up Tara with all her gear. That was the period when the battle of Cnucha was fought, in which fell Cumall son of Trenmor. . . ."

"After the death of Cumall the chieftainship of the *Fiana* was made over to the great-deeded Goll mac Morna, who held it for ten years. But a son had been born to Cumall, which was Finn; and up to the age of ten years he was (perforce) a-marauding and a-trespassing. In this his tenth year Tara's Feast was made by the king, Conn, the Hundred Fighter: and as all Ireland drank and enjoyed themselves in the great house of the Midehuart," the youth Finn appeared before them. "The king of Ireland looked at the youth; for to him and to the others in the *bruidhen* the youth was unknown." The king put his horn of state into the youth's hand and inquired: "Whose boy is this?" "I am Finn mac Cumall . . . son to the warrior that formerly held the chieftainship of the *Fiana*, and I am come to procure my friendship with thee." So Conn took Finn into his service.

"Then with a smooth and polished drinking-horn that was in his hand the king of Ireland stood up and said: 'If, men of Ireland, I might find among you one that until the point of rising day upon the morrow should preserve Tara that she be not burnt by Aillén mac Midhna, his rightful heritage . . . I would bestow on him.' " After the others had refused the offer, Finn took it up, and Conn gave securities that Finn if successful should receive his heritage.

After this "Fiacha mac Congha that to Finn's father Cumall had been a young man of trust," without the knowledge of the sons of Morna or anybody else, furnished Finn with "a certain spear of deadly property and with which no devious cast was ever made."

Finn thereupon went out to defend Tara against the goblin.

It was not long before he heard a plaintive strain, and to his forehea he held the flat of the spear-head and its point. Aillén began and played his *timpán* till he had lulled everyone else to sleep, and then to consume Tara emitted from his mouth his blast of fire. But to this Finn opposed the

crimson fringed mantle which he wore so that the flame fell down through the air carrying with it the fourfold mantle a twenty-six span's depth into the earth; whereby *ard na teinedeh* or "fire hill" is the name of that eminence. . . . When Aillén was aware that his magical contrivance was all baffled he returned to *sidh Finnachaidh* on the summit of *sliabh Fuaid*. Thither Finn followed him and, putting his finger into the spear's thong as Aillén passed in at the door of the *sid*, delivered a well-calculated and successful throw that entered Aillén in the upper part of his back, and in form of a great lump of black blood drove his heart out through his mouth. Finn beheaded him, carried the head back to Tara and fixed it upon a stake.

To Aillén then his mother came and, after giving way to great grief, went to seek a leech for him:

Come hither O she-physician of Amairtha: by Fiacha mac Congha's spear, by the fatal mantle and by the pointed javelin, Aillén mac Midhna is slain! Alas! Aillén is fallen. . . . Come hither out of [Benn] Boirche, O she-physician! . . . Blithe was Aillén mac Midhna of Sliabh Fuaid, nine times he burnt up Tara!

After this victory over the goblin Conn gave Goll his choice, either to quit Ireland or to lay his hand in Finn's, and Goll chose to serve Finn. Finn received the chieftainship of the *Flana* and held it till he died. And it was by this spear "that Finn ever and always had all his fortune, and the spear's constant original name was *birgha* or 'spit-spear.'"

According to this longer account, the goblin is named Aillén, not Cúldub, and instead of carrying off a portion of a feast, he burns the king's city. But Finn slays him with the spear of Fiacaíl just as he did Cúldub, and in both cases the cast of the spear takes effect just as the goblin is entering his fairy-knoll. In both cases the goblin has made repeated visits, and only Finn is successful in conquering him. The stories are essentially the same. Here as in the other stories the spear is a talisman: "By means of this spear Finn ever and always had all his fortune." Evidently all three forms of "Finn and the Goblin" belong together, and are in fact variants of one story.

XII

A comparison of the different forms of "Finn and the Goblin" shows that the essential elements in the story are the recurrent molestation of a feast by a malevolent fairy who is finally slain by

a youthful hero with a marvelous spear. These are also the striking features in the English *Sir Perceval* (*Sp*), as a summary of the romance will make clear:

Sir Perceval the elder, father of the hero, frequents tournaments where his bitterest opponents are the Red Knight and the Black. The Red Knight by the aid of "wicked armour" kills him "in battle and in fight." The mother Ache flour with the infant Perceval and one maid goes to a forest, where she brings the boy up in ignorance of the way men fight. Of the father's belongings she takes only a little "scottes spere." As the boy grows up he uses the spear to kill birds and deer, which he brings to his mother. When he is about fifteen years old, he meets in the forest three of Arthur's knights. From them he learns about King Arthur. He runs down a wild mare, mounts it, and rides home to his mother, telling her that he is going to Arthur's court to be made knight. He carries with him his father's spear, a ring that his mother gives him, and sets out on the mare, having no bridle except a withy.

He finds a lady in a hall (we are told in another place that she is wife to the Black Knight) and exchanges rings with her (we learn later that the ring which he gets by exchange preserves the wearer from death and wounds). King Arthur is seated at his Christmas feast when the youth all roughly accoutered rides into the hall. The boy does not know his name, but Arthur calls him "fair child" and says that if he were well dressed he would resemble the elder Perceval. At this moment the Red Knight enters, seizes a golden cup from before the king, and rides away with it. Arthur says that for fifteen years the Red Knight has done this and no one can stop him unless it be Sir Perceval's son; "the books say that he shall avenge his father's death." Arthur promises to reward the youth with knighthood provided that he will strike down the Red Knight. Arthur goes to fetch armor, but Perceval, without waiting, pursues the Red Knight and slays him with a single cast of his "scottes spere" that pierces him through the eye. Perceval covets the red armor, but not knowing how to unlace it, tries to burn the Red Knight's body out. Sir Gawain coming up shows Perceval how to unlace the red armor and buckle it on. Perceval sends Gawain back to Arthur with the golden cup. Perceval meets with the Witch

Mother who, because of the red armor, mistakes him for her son, the Red Knight, and remarks that though he were slain, she could restore him to life unless he were burned. Whereupon Perceval kills her and burns her body likewise.

Perceval spends the night with an old man (who, as we learn later, is his uncle). He hears from a messenger that Lufamour the Queen of Maidenland is in trouble, and he sets off alone to rescue her. He slays a "sowdan" named Gollerothrame who was besieging Maidenland and marries the rescued Lufamour. After a stay of one year Perceval sets out to find his mother. In the forest he meets a weeping lady who tells him that she is being punished by her husband the Black Knight because she has lost her ring. Perceval overcomes the Black Knight and reconciles him to the lady. Perceval finds that a giant, a brother of Gollerothrame, has driven his mother to insanity by making her believe that he has killed her son. He slays the giant, cures his mother by means of a drink which he finds in the giant's house, and returns happily with her to Maidenland.

The parallelism between *Sp* and the story of "Finn and the Goblin" in the *Accallam* (A) may be summed up as follows: In both, the scene is at the court¹ of the king of the land and at a great feast held at a yearly festival (Christmas or Hallowe'en). In both, the land has been enchanted since the slaying of the hero's father by a supernatural warrior who has insulted and injured the king each year at a festival. In both, the youthful hero is unknown at court, but is recognized by the king. In both no one but the youthful hero ventures to attack the supernatural foe. In both, the youthful hero, who without knowledge of the court is equipped with a spear furnished by a relative (mother or uncle), slays the enchanter by a cast of his spear. In both, the enchanter or goblin has a

¹ Tara, the capital city of the Irish king, had been bewitched for twenty-three years, we are told, although we read later that Finn was but ten years old, and that Aillén had nine times burnt Tara, which seems to prove that the spell had lasted but ten years. *Sp* has a similar discrepancy about the duration of the enchantment. Fifteen years have elapsed since the Red Knight killed Perceval's father, and yet we read "Fyfe jeres hase he bus gane" (633) (where Holthausen emends to "Fyftene"); and again "Sythen taken hase he three [cups]" (637), which might mean that but three Hallowe'ens had passed. Whatever explanation we may adopt for these inconsistencies, it is reasonable to hold that in both narratives the enchantment must have rested upon the land from the time when the hero's father was slain until the youthful hero, aided by his father's magic arms, slew the enchanter.

supernatural mother, and there is talk of a possibility of restoring the enchanter to life.

In the Irish, Finn kills the goblin with the cast of a spear just as the latter is entering his fairy-knoll. That the fairy man is slain at the entrance to his subterranean dwelling is probably a primitive idea. It occurs in all the Irish versions. In the English *Sp* a rather distinct trace of this fairy-knoll remains. Perceval kills the Red Knight with a cast of his father's spear at a hill. This might at first appear an ordinary hill, but after Perceval has slain the Red Knight and put on the armor, Gawain remarks: "Goo we faste fro this hill . . . it neghes nere nyghte" (806-8), which is a pointless remark unless the hill be a fairy-knoll (*sid*), near which it would, of course, be dangerous to tarry at night. It seems safe to conclude, therefore, that the hill which is mentioned five times (697, 780, 806, 838, 845) is a surviving trace of the Red Knight's *sid* or fairy abode.

The spear with which Finn killed the goblin was given him by his uncle Fiacail. Since the father, Cumall, had many treasures and talismans,¹ and since Fiacail had been to Cumall "a young man of trust," this spear may have belonged to Finn's father; anyhow it was a talismanic spear that brought good luck, and it came from fairyland. The spear in *Sp* was the only one of the father's belongings that was carried away by the mother to the forest and given to the son. It is not definitely called a talisman, but the progress of the action makes this a highly probable conjecture.

The scene in the Irish where King Conn, after complaining of the yearly depredations of his uncanny foe, offers to restore to any man who will ward off this enemy his rightful heritage (in Finn's case, of course, the command of the *Ftana*) is like that in *Sp*, where Arthur after complaining of the yearly ravages of the Red Knight offers to make Perceval a knight (that is, to receive him into the company of the warriors) provided that he recover the cup from the Red Knight.

'Als I am trewe king,' said he,

'A knyghte sall I make the,

For-thi þou wille brynge mee

The coupe of golde bryghte.' 648.²

¹ See John McNeill, *Dunair Finn*, pp. 21 f., 34 f., 119 f., 135 f.

² There is no parallel in *A* to the recovery of the cup. When the king stood up to speak to Finn, he held "a polished drinking-horn in his hand."

The central incident in *Sp* appears then to belong to what may be called the "Finn and the Goblin" type. In *Sp*, however, the "Goblin" incident is a part of an *enfances* framework. Now a "Goblin" episode as a part of an *enfances* framework occurs in an Irish story, the *Macnámhartha Finn (M)*,¹ the resemblance of which to *Sp* is so close that it has been noticed repeatedly. *M* owes its preservation, no doubt, to the fact that it was told as heroic saga and was made a part of the supposed history of Finn. In the process of adapting it to history the marvelous elements out of which it has been built up have become obscured, but a little study of it will reveal that it belonged originally to the group of *enfances féeriques*. The importance of *M* has not been hitherto generally recognized because of the accident that it exists in no MS older than the fifteenth century. Before the recent advances in Irish scholarship it was usually referred to as a fifteenth-century tale.² One could urge, therefore (if he were sufficiently resolute), that it might be a decayed and confused version of French Arthurian romance; that it might possibly be a last stage of deterioration from literary forms, rather than a genuine survival of the living folk-tale out of which as a germ literary Arthurian romances grew. Any hypothesis of this sort is now shown to be impossible because of the evidence that *M* was in existence substantially in its present form in the twelfth century, and is therefore too old to be explained by French romance.

Twenty years ago students of Irish were not sufficiently sure of the history of grammatical forms to assert that an Irish saga text was ancient unless it was contained in *LU* (a MS written before 1106),³ or in *LL* (a MS of 1150). The development of Irish scholarship has now made it certain that many texts which exist solely in later MSS belong almost or quite in their present form to the twelfth century or earlier. Evidence has been accumulating that

¹ "The Youthful Exploits of Finn," which exists in a MS of 1453, but is declared to be a copy of older documents. It has been edited by Meyer, *Rev. Celt.*, V (1881-83), 195-204; cf. his corrections, *Archiv f. Celt. Lex.*, I, 482; and translated by him, *Eriu*, I (1904), 180-90. On its resemblance to *Sp*, see Nutt, *Folk-Lore Record*, IV (1881), 9 f.; *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail* (1888), pp. 152 f.; Griffith, *Sir Perceval*, Chicago dissertation, 1911.

² E.g., Nutt, *Folk and Hero Tales*, ed. MacInnes (1891), p. 415.

³ Compare my procedure in "Iwain," *Harvard Studies and Notes*, VIII (1903) 27 f. On *LU* see Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight* (1916), pp. 290 f.

M,¹ though in a fifteenth-century MS, and though the language contains some later forms, is in truth one of these older texts. Professor Kuno Meyer, the latest editor of *M*, entirely without reference to its possible relations to *Sp*, unhesitatingly declares it to be a composition of the twelfth century.² We shall see that several Irish texts which exist in twelfth-century MSS, notably the *Fotha Catha Cnucha*³ and a poem beginning *A Rí richid* by Gilla in Chomded,⁴ establish this dating beyond a doubt. Taken together they indicate a knowledge in the twelfth century of most of the incidents of *M*. I will print summaries of these two important twelfth-century texts in parallel to a summary of *M*,⁵ so that in the case of each incident the guaranty for its existence in the twelfth century may be clear at a glance. The *Fotha Catha*⁶ ends before the point at which Gilla in Chomded's poem begins so that both can be arranged in one column.

The following table will also serve another purpose. By printing a summary of *Sp* in a third column all incidents which are parallel in *Sp* and *M* appear, and the extent to which these incidents can be proved to have been known in the twelfth century becomes apparent.

¹ For references see an article by Professor Pace in *PMLA*, XXXII (1917), 598-604. To Pace's materials I am able to add the evidence of two twelfth-century Irish documents, and partly by the help of these documents I believe it possible to show that the number of incidents common to *Sp* and *M* is nearer twelve than seven, the number which he observed. Pace's article is one of promise, and I regret to note his recent death while on military relief work in France.

² *Fianaigeacht* (1910), p. xxviii. Long since Meyer asserted that the presence of Old-Irish forms fixes the date of a text. Even if we were to assume that some later scribe had tried to deceive us, his knowledge would have been insufficient to enable him to insert genuine Old-Irish grammatical forms. The later scribes had a desire to change grammatical forms of the older language into modern forms, but "few had sufficient knowledge of the older language to enable them to do so correctly. The later the period, the less Old-Irish was understood, the greater their difficulties of dealing intelligently with extinct forms," Meyer, *Anec. Oxon.* (1894), VIII, viii. "I think that if in a late copy we find among modern surroundings Old-Irish forms almost or entirely unchanged occurring with any frequency we may safely assume that we have then a copy which is ultimately derived from an Old-Irish source," *ibid.*, p. x. The researches of Strachan, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1894 ff., are of fundamental importance for the dating of Irish texts.

³ "Cause of the Battle of Cnucha," which has been edited and translated from *LU* by Hennessy, *Rev. Celt.*, II (1873-75), 86 f., and has been edited by Windisch, *Kurzgefasste Ir. Gram.* (1879), pp. 121 f. Cf. also Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. xxv. The *Fotha Catha* is told, not as heroic saga like *M*, but as veritable history, and all traces of the marvelous have been removed.

⁴ Edited and translated by Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-51.

⁵ From Meyer's translation, *Eriu*, I (1904), 180-90.

⁶ From Hennessy's translation, *Rev. Celt.*, II, 91 f. I give the section numbers of the editors named.

Fotha Catha

M

Sp

§§ 1 and 2

Cumall fought a battle against Urgriu and Aed son of Daire *derg* (also called Morna). Cumall was slain by Aed. The latter lost an eye by the spear of Luchet, and was thereafter called Goll.

Cumall mac Trénmór was slain in the battle of Cnucha by Aed who lost an eye by the spear of Luchet and was thereafter called Goll (i.e. the one-eyed).¹ Goll was son of Daire *derg* (the Red), also called Morna, and he displaced Cumall as captain of the *fian*. "The man who kept Cumall's treasure-bag wounded Cumall in the battle." Another foe was Urgriu.

The elder Perceval, father of the hero, was "Slayne in batelle and in fighte" by the Red Knight (161-62).

§ 3

(One stanza of a poem almost exactly as in *M*.)

(Verses describing the fight.)

§ 4

Muirne bore a son called Demni (later called Finn). The boy was nursed up secretly "in the house of Fiacail mac Conchinn . . . for a sister to Cumall was Fiacail's wife, Bodball Bendron."

After the battle Cumall's wife Muirne bore a son Demne (later called Finn). Two women-warriors (*dá banfeindig*), Bodball *bandrai*,² and the Grey One of Luachair (*in Liath Luachra*),³ with the help of Fiacail mac Conchinn carried away the boy, for the mother "durst not let him be with her." The two women-warriors brought up the boy secretly in the forest of Slieve

(Perceval was born before his father's death 101-4).

P. was carried by his mother and one maid to a wood and there reared (163 f.).

¹ Aed means "fire." "Fire son to Daire the Red" may plausibly be the origin of the Red Knight in *Sp*. Aed was a common Irish name, but it may have been common because men were named after a demi-god. Cf. *Cormac's Glossary*, s.v. *Aed*, *Anecdota from Irish MSS*, IV, 4, 33. According to Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum, Hib.*, I, xxviii, the life of St. Aed shows traces of borrowings from a fire-deity. (The saint's qualities, however, might have been suggested solely by his name.)

² She evidently corresponds to Bodball Bendron in the *Fotha Catha*. Bendron is perhaps to be emended to *bandrai*, "sorceress." The *Fotha Catha* reveals the fact that Fiacail was Finn's uncle. A twelfth-century poem by Gilla Modutu in *LL* printed in *Fianaigeacht*, p. xxix, calls Bodball "Finn's foster-mother (a *mummi maith*).

³ This person is a woman, and cannot be identical with Liath Luachra, a warrior who, intrusted with Cumall's treasure bag, wounded Cumall in the battle, and was later slain by Finn.

Poika Catha

M

Sp

§ 4

Bloom. "That was indeed necessary for many a sturdy stalwart youth and many a venomous hostile warrior and angry fierce champion . . . of the sons of Morna were lying in wait for that boy."

§ 5

After six years the mother Muirne passed through one wilderness to another until she visited her son in the forest of Slieve Bloom. She was "afraid of the sons of Morna for him." She left him in charge of the women-warriors, bidding them take charge of the boy till he should be fit to be a warrior.

§ 6

Finn went hunting alone and "cut off at a shot the feathers and wings" of a duck upon a lake.

Perceval shot small birds (217-24).

§ 7

He was for a time in the house of Fiaccail mac Codna, but the two women-warriors carried him away with them again.

Perceval does not know his name: "I ame myn awnn modirs childe."

§ 8

He entered a game of hurley against a band of youths.

§§ 9 and 10

They called him Finn ("the fair")¹ on account of his shapeliness.

King Arthur calls him, "Faire childe and free" (501-6).

Gilla in Chomded's poem

§§ 2-4

Glaisdic was [Finn's] name originally. The sons of Morna named him Finn.

¹ That the parallel to *Sp* at this point is significant is proved by the occurrence of something similar to the name "the fair" in almost all stories of the sort: In Chrétien the mother calls her son "Blax filz" (353); in *Bl*, "Biaus filus" (ed. Potvin, 1232); in Wolfram, "bon fiz, scher fiz, bēā fiz" (113, 4; 140, 6); in *Li Biaus Descones*, "biel fil," vs. 117; in *Libeaus Desconus*, "Beau fis" (ed. Kaluza, vss. 26, 66); in *Méridauc*, "le biel vallet" (10774); in the *Prose Lancelot*, "le biau trove," etc. (ed. Sommer, III, 22). In the *Enfances Gauvain* the boy is called "bel fil," *Romania*, XXXIX, 22, 2d frg. 32.

Gilla in Chomded

M

Sp

§ 11

"Seven years he was in hard plight, under Loch Ree he found 'fair help' (findehobair)." "Finn's first race . . . into Loch Corrib from Loch Ree around Con-naught."

§ 11

He ran a race with the deer of Fiaclach mac Con-chenn.

§ 16

Seven deer by Slieve Bloom was Finn's first chase, . . . a brave and stout exertion.

§ 28

"Thirty jewels . . . Finn took out of the jaws of the crane-bag, after he had slain Glonna² at the vast ford, and Liath Luachra of the swift deeds."

§ 5

In the eighth year of his life

He found the youths swimming. "He jumps into the lake to them, and drowns nine of them in the lake." People said, "Finn drowned the youths," so that henceforth the name Finn clave to him.

§ 12

Once a "fleet herd of wild deer" was seen by him, and he ran down two bucks among them, and brought them to the two women-warriors. He was hunting in this wise till one day the women-warriors said to him, "Go now from us for the sons of Morna are watching to kill thee."

§ 13

After this he took service with the King of Bantry, and no hunter was his equal. And the king said, "If Cumall had left a son one would think thou wast he."

§ 14

A similar incident occurred while he was in service to the King of Kerry.

§ 15

A chief smith named Lochán made two spears for him, and with one of them he slew a famous sow and brought the head for a bridal gift to the smith's daughter.

§ 16

A weeping woman told Finn that her son Glonda had been slain by "a tall, very terrible warrior." Finn "went in pur-

"per wes no beste
bat welke one fote,
To fle fro hym was
it no bote, When
bat he wolde hym
have" (222-24).

He saw a group of wild mares, ran down the biggest and rode on it to his mother (325-64).

Arthur thinks if he were well dressed he would resemble the elder Perceval.

"And ever more
trowed hee, bat þe
childe scholde bee
Sir Percyvell son"
(545-88).

Perceval found a weeping woman tied to a tree by her husband the

¹ "Findehobair" may be a name for Finn's foster-mother or *mumme*.

² The Irish (*iar n-guin Glonda*) merely says "after the slaying of Glonna and Liath Luachra" and need not necessarily contradict *M*, according to which Liath Luachra slew Glonna.

Gilla in Chomded

§ 5

when he was visiting Dathi's Tara, he slew [Aillén] whose hand was full with candle . . . with *timpán*.

§ 6

"'A *timpán* for sleep,' said all, the practice at each Hallowe'en a customary deed, every year."

§ 8

"For fear of sword-fierce Conn Finn went to learn noble poetry. Cethern mac Fintain was his tutor in poetic composition."

§ 9

"After a feast the *fiana* bring Finn to avenge the poet Orcbél, the fairy woman from Slieve Slánga had achieved the fierce, bold deed . . . this was his journey on that night from Bri Ele."

§ 13

"In revenge of the poet Orcbél Finn slew Ua Fid-

M

§ 16

suit of the warrior, and they fight a combat, and he fell by him. This is how he was: he had the treasure bag with him, to wit the treasures of Cumall. He who had fallen there was Liath Luachra ("The Grey One of Luachair") who had dealt the first wound to Cumall in the Battle of Cnucha."

§§ 17-19

Finn visited Crimall mac Trénmór [his uncle]. He went to learn poetry from Finnées on the Boyne, and he tasted the salmon of wisdom. "He durst not remain in Ireland else, until he took to poetry, for fear of the son of Urgriu, and of the sons of Morna."

§ 20

(A poem by which Finn proved his skill.)

§ 21

Finn went to Cethern mac Fintan further to learn poetry with him. They both went to woo a maiden in the fairy-knoll of Bri Ele. Every year at Hallowe'en the fairy knolls of Ireland were open, and every Hallowe'en a man of Ireland went to woo this maiden, but it always happened that some man belonging to the wooer's company was slain.

§ 22

As Finn and Cethern went toward the fairy-knoll, Oirbél the poet, one of their people was slain.

Sp

Black Knight. He overcame the Black Knight (1817-1932).

He slew the Red Knight not knowing that he was the one who slew his father (629-40, 689-92, 709).

Gilla in Chomded

§ 13

ga . . . with the
spear of Fiacilach
mac Conchind."

§ 14

"Two staves
Finn heard."

§ 15

"'Venom is the
spear' was the
powerful begin-
ning of the second
stave . . . there
after the deed of
valour on bright
Allhallowe'en he
heard them."

§ 17

"A vessel full of
gold, of glorious
silver, the woman
out of Slieve Slán-
ga gave to him;
we know for cer-
tain that this was
the first fair treas-
ure that he took to
the *fian* for noble
distribution."

M

§ 23

Finn was angry and went to the
house of Fiacail for advice.
Fiacail gave Finn a spear and
told him to watch the fairy
mounds on Hallowe'en.

§ 24

Finn watched until the fairy-
knoll opened, cast Fiacail's spear,
and killed a fairy-man, Aed mac
Fidga.

§ 25

Finn heard the fairies lament
and repeat a quatrain, "Venom
is the spear," etc.

§ 26

Finn recovered his spear by
seizing a fairy-woman as hostage
for its return.

§ 27

Finn vied with Fiacail¹ his
uncle in feats of strength.

§ 28

Fiacail set Finn to watch ask-
ing to be waked if he heard any
(cry of) outrage. Finn heard a
cry in the night, and did not
wake Fiacail, but pursued alone
and overtook three fairy-women
outside the green mound of Slieve
Slanga. He snatched a brooch
from one of them. She asked
back her brooch, and promised a
reward. (The sentence is incom-
plete and the conclusion is sup-
plied by Meyer from the poem
of Gilla in Chomded [§ 17].)

Sp

Perceval spent
the night with his
uncle who was the
father of nine sons
(936 f., 1050).

Perceval sent
back his three
cousins on some
pretext, and trav-
eled on alone to
an adventure
(1033 f.).

He won the love
of Lufamour in
Maidenlande
(1221-1815).

¹ From the *Fotha Catha* we learn that Fiacail was Finn's uncle by marriage. In 17-19 above, Finn visited Crimall, his father's brother. In *Sp* the hero visited Arthur and the old man with nine sons. Both were uncles. In *Peredur* the hero visited two uncles in succession and engaged in feats of arms. In Chrétien Gornemans is an uncle and he taught the use of arms. Clearly an uncle who teaches the hero skill in arms is a part of the story formula we are studying.

This table shows that most of the events in *M* are attested by texts which exist in twelfth-century MSS. It shows further a remarkable parallelism between *M* and *Sp*. First it may be well to observe that *M* contains some episodes that correspond to nothing in *Sp*. These are: the visit of the mother¹ (5); the hero's stay as a child with his uncle, and the game of hurley (7-9); his drowning nine youths in a lake (11); his love affair with the daughter of Locan the smith (15); his learning poetry, tasting the salmon of wisdom, and his revenge on the fairy folk for slaying Oirebel the poet (17-26). It is also true that a few incidents in *Sp* find no parallel in *M*: the hero's encounter with the Red Knight's witch mother; his battle with a second giant (Gollerothrame's brother, 2005 f.); and his rescue of his mother. An *enfances* framework is meant to hold episodes, and the insertion of a number of episodes into *M*, or the omission of a few from *Sp*, in nowise invalidates the approximate identity of the framework of the two stories. The significant fact is that some twelve incidents are common to the older Irish and to the English story. Since these incidents occur in the same order in both² the parallelism cannot possibly be fortuitous. The framework of the two stories is the same.

Both the Irish *M* and the English *Sp* relate (1) that the hero's father was slain in battle; (2) that he was reared far from men by two women; (3) that he showed skill in killing birds; (4) that he was swift enough of foot to run down wild animals; (5) that his real name was concealed; (6) that a king suspects his identity; (7) that he was called "The Fair One" (Finn), or "faire child"; (8) that he

¹ In *Lí Biaus Desconeús* the mother visits the hero while he is with his fairy nurse, so that this incident is probably original, and has been dropped in *Sp*.

² The parallel to the youth's being called Finn ("the fair"), §§ 9-10, occurs at a slightly later place in *Sp*, but is an idea that might have been mentioned more than once. The only real transposition of incident is in § 16, where the weeping woman occurs near the end of *Sp*, and the reason for it is clearly a difference in plot. *Sp* divides Liath Luachra into two figures, a Red Knight and a Black, both enemies, whom the hero encounters separately. The Black Knight is subdued but not slain. In *M* the hero avenges at one stroke both the weeping woman and his father.

A tenth-century Irish poem, quoted above, p. 27, tells of two fairy foes, Aed mac Fidaig and Cúldub mac Fida, who were successively slain by Finn with Fiaccail's spear. Gilla in Chomded likewise knows two foes, one a fire goblin, another the fairy man who "was slain about the maiden of Bri Eile." In these goblin brothers (for Fidaig and Fida are probably the same patronymic) it is tempting to trace the origin of the Red Knight and the Black Knight in *Sp* who were successively overcome by Perceval. Aed means "fire" or "red." *Cúl dub* means "black back."

avenged a weeping woman; (9) and avenged himself unwittingly on a mysterious man who had killed or helped to kill his father; (10) that he visited his uncle's house; (11) that he rid himself of the companionship of his uncle, or his cousins, to go alone; (12) that he had an adventure with a damsel at a fairy-knoll ("Maiden Land" in *Sp*).

All of these parallels are guaranteed by twelfth-century Irish references except (3), (8), and (11). No. (3) certainly belongs to the Irish *enfances* formula because it is one of the exploits of the youthful Cuchulinn.¹ No. (8), although Gilla in Chomded does not mention the significant detail of the weeping woman, was almost certainly known to him.² His statement, "Thirty jewels Finn took out of the crane-bag after the slaying of Glonna and Liath Luachra," agrees precisely, as far as it goes, with *M*. Because of this exact agreement one can hardly go wrong in assuming that the omission of the weeping woman is a mere accident occasioned by the laconic style of the poet. No. (11) is, probably, the sole parallel left without guarantee. Its omission would not perceptibly weaken our evidence.

No argument is needed to establish the existence of a literary connection between Irish and English. The parallelism is too complete to be fortuitous. Furthermore this parallelism extends beyond mere folklore to details that appear to be the work of literary elaboration. Compare, for example, the speech of the King of Kerry in the Irish to that of King Arthur in the English (in both Irish and English the king is addressing a youthful hero whose identity is unknown). The King of Kerry says:

"If Cumall had left a son, one would think thou wast he."
(*M*, § 13). King Arthur says:

And þou were wele dighte,
þou were lyke to a knyghte,
þat I lovede with all my myghte,
Whills he was one lyve. 548.

The changes that appear in the English version are exactly of the sort that one might expect the author of a romance of chivalry to

¹ Cuchulinn killed a swan. See Windisch, *Irische Texte*, extraband (1905), p. 163.

² Poets assume that their hearers understand allusions, and the problem of restoring a folk-tale from references to it in Middle-Irish poems is something like what it would be, e.g., to restore the classical tale of Arethusa from Milton's allusions to it in *Lycidas*.

make. The emphasis placed on good clothes ("wele dighte") is to be noted as showing that the English version is addressed to a different state of society from that in which the Irish arose.

In both Irish and English the hero leaves his uncle to go alone to an adventure with a fairy woman. In the Irish we read:

"Finn did not wake the warrior. He went alone" (*M*, § 28). The English version runs:

Ever he sende one a-gayne
At ilke a myle ende,
un-till þay ware all gane;
þan he rydes hym allane. 1042.

Some significant connection between Irish and English is indicated by the way in which most of the personages in the English may be matched by like personages in the Irish, and this correspondence extends in the case of several of the chief personages even to names. "Faire child" is a good translation of Finn ("the fair"); the Red Knight must be connected in some way with Aed mac Daire Dearg ("Fire, son of Daire the Red"), and Gollerotherame the giant shares the first part of his name with Goll mac Morna, about whom in Irish story the tradition of giant size especially clung.¹

¹ The *Fiana* were all regarded as of great stature, but Goll's gigantic size was especially well known, being referred to even by writers of English. Dunbar (before 1520) speaks of "mekle Gow McMorne" as a giant (ed. Small, II [1893], 317). Gavin Douglas (before 1513) in his "Pallice of Honour" has the lines:

Grellt Gowmakmorne, and Fyn Makkoul, and how
Thay suld be goddis in Ireland, as thay say (ed. Small, I [1874], 65).

Barbour in his *Bruce* (1375) refers to "Gol mak Morn" and "Fyngal" (ed. Skeat, *STS*, Bk. III, 61). Hector Boece in his *History of Scotland* (1526) describes the giant size of "Fyn son of heaven": "Fynnanum filium coeli (Fyn mak Coul, vulgari vocabulo) virum, uti ferunt, immani statura (septenum enim cubitorum hominem fuisse narrant) Scotici sanguinis, venatoria arte insignem, omnibusque insolita corporis mole formidolosum" (ed. 1575, p. 128). Keating, the seventeenth-century Irish historian, thinks it necessary to argue that Finn was not a giant (ed. Dinneen, II [1907], 330).

In post-twelfth-century development of the Finn saga, Goll as the leader of the Clann Morna became very prominent, often overtopping Finn in interest, but I find no mention of Goll mac Morna before the twelfth century. I conjecture that Goll ("blind" or "one-eyed") was at first not a proper name, but a common epithet for any one-eyed giant, or Fomorlian. A good many giants named Goll figure in Middle-Irish literature; in the twelfth-century prose *Dindsenchas* (*Rev. Celt.*, XV, 323) "Goll glass" is a giant who has a giantess daughter named "Gabal"; in the "Violent Deaths of Goll and Garb" (*Rev. Celt.*, XIV, 405 f., from *LL*) Cuchullinn slew a giant named Goll who had one huge eye projecting from his head and another eye strangely sunken; Goll and Irgoll were chieftains of the Fomorians in *Cath Maige Tured* (§ 128, *Rev. Celt.*, XII, 97). Another giant named Goll is referred to in Wood-Martin, *Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland*, I, 351-52. In "Laegaire's Visit to Fairy Land" (ed. Cross, *Modern Philology*, XIII, 156-62) a redoubtable adversary, Goll mac Duilb, who was probably a giant, was at war with the fairy folk, and was slain by Laegaire, who thus freed Mag Mell from

In the entire absence of any other explanation for the facts observed the natural conclusion is that *Sp* and *M* go back, probably through several removes, to a common original *X*. The sequence of events in *Sp* and *M* is essentially the same. Both begin with the *enfances* formula and both contain an incident of the "Finn and the Goblin" type.

It may be well to consider how far *M* belongs to the "Finn and the Goblin" type—that is, how far the "Goblin" episode figures in *M*. This is desirable both because the type has not before been studied, and because the episode is altered in *M* in such a way that it might escape a hasty observer. The alteration consists in the fact that the "goblin," instead of molesting a feast, or burning a royal city, has repeatedly slain a man of Ireland.

The parallelism between this part of *M* and the episode of "Goblin" (*A*) in the *Acallam* may be summed up as follows: In both *M* and *A*, a goblin foe has injured Finn's friends on successive Hallowe'ens. (In *M*, Aed has slain several men of Ireland; in *A*, Aillén has burnt Tara.) In both *M* and *A*, Finn gets advice and a spear from Fiacaíl. In both *M* and *A*, Finn kills the goblin on Hallowe'en with Fiacaíl's spear just as the uncanny foe is entering his fairy-knoll. In both *M* and *A* the goblin is lamented by the fairy folk. It is not told in *M* who voiced this lament; in *A* it was uttered by the mother. Aed's patronymic "mac Fídga" in *M* seems a mere distortion of Aillén "mac Mídhna" in *A*. One of the oldest MSS of *A* calls him once "Faillén mac Fídhgha."¹ Aed, which means "fire," is easily explained as another epithet for the fire-goblin Aillén. Ninth-century tales about Finn mention a supernatural

oppression. The situation is like the war between the Tuatha Dé Danaan and the Fomorians in *Cath Maige Tured*.

Gaelic ballads relate battles between Finn and one-eyed monsters. See J. F. Campbell, *Leabhar na Feinne* (1872), pp. 59 f., and especially the story of Finn's killing an enchanter named Roc who had but one hand, one foot, and one eye, at Ess Ruadh, p. 63. The Lays and Middle-Irish tales call Goll "na Beumanan" (Goll of the blows). This epithet is regularly applied to Balor, the well-known one-eyed leader of the Fomorians, "Balor Beimann" (Larminie, *West Irish Folk-Tales* [1893], p. 1; Curtin, *Hero-Tales* [1894], p. 296), which suggests that at least in later tales Goll and Balor are confused. Finn's goblin foe perhaps grew out of tales about Fomorians like Balor who were adversaries of the Tuatha Dé Danaan. Any one of these might have been named Goll, and have been the original of Gollerotherame.

¹ Rawlinson B. 487, folio 21a, quoted by Stokes, *Acallam*, p. 287.

foe called Aed.¹ The parallels pointed out between *M* and *A* find an echo throughout in *Sp*.

Both *M* and a part of *Sp*, therefore, belong to the "Finn and the Goblin" type. *X*, the hypothetical source of *M* and *Sp*, must also have contained the "Goblin" episode, doubtless in a form more like the older folk-tales in which the goblin troubled a feast. We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that *M* and *Sp* rest upon a common original *X*, which was doubtless a folk-tale² about a combat between demi-gods and giants, carried on by means of talismanic weapons. The main part of the thread of *X* is preserved in *M*, but it has been rigorously euhemerized, and owes its preservation to the fact that it was regarded as history, and was attached to the historical or pseudo-historical Finn saga.

The evidence of *M* proves that the central episode in *Sp* originally belonged to the "Finn and the Goblin" type of story, and *M* gives us a fair idea of what *X*, the source of *Sp*, was like.

XIII

It must not be forgotten that *M* and *Sp* have both been rationalized, although in different ways. *M* keeps the formula of *X* better than *Sp*. On the other hand *Sp* retains better the supernatural machinery. The author of *M* appears to have had an aversion to the marvelous, which he has carefully eliminated, doubtless because he wished his heroic saga to be connected with the annals of Ireland. He retained, however, Finn's encounter with the fairies at a *sid* (21 f.), no doubt because it did not strike Irish hearers as unhistorical.

The author of *Sp*, which was frankly a romance, had no objection to the supernatural as such, as witness his use of the Red Knight's magic armor, of the ring that rendered the wearer invulnerable, and of the witch mother who could restore her son to life. The

¹ See *Rev. Celt.*, XIII, 17 f.

² Panzer's "Bärensohn" formula (*Studien zur Germ. Sagengeschichte*, 1910, I) resembles *Sp* more than it does *Beowulf*, for *Beowulf* contains nothing corresponding to the hero's rescue of a princess from an other-world land and his subsequent marriage to her, which is a part of the formula, and which is in *Sp*. Panzer builds up his formula out of more than two hundred folk-tales so widely separated in place and time from each other and from the home of the *Beowulf* poem that his book merely demonstrates a probability (cf. von Sadow, *ZFDA*, LIII (1911), 123-31) that *Beowulf* has a basis in *märchen*. Panzer's book could be used to establish with at least equal probability a *märchen* background for *Sp*.

rationalization that has affected *Sp* is rather an unconscious process occasioned by the inability of the narrator, perhaps of a series of narrators, to conceive the incidents as other than a part of the chivalric life of the age and of the people for whom he told his romance. Examples of this process are seen in his calling the battle in which the elder Perceval was killed a tournament; in his making King Arthur dub Perceval knight; and in his picturing the giant Gollerotherame as a "sowdane" who fights with a sword. The tendency is that usual in earlier times and no different in principle from Garrick's playing Macbeth in powdered wig and velvet breeches. Its effect, however, is to blur the machinery of the plot.

The *Fotha Catha Cnucha*, because it is told as straight history, has been rationalized to an extreme degree. In it scarcely a trace of the original folk-tale formula is discernible.¹

Not only are the changes wrought by rationalization important; also the structure of these two Irish pseudo-historical documents *M* and *Fotha Catha* demands a moment's consideration. *M* has, evidently, been unskillfully patched together out of two independent accounts, thus introducing two characters called "The Grey One of Luachair."² The first is a woman (§ 4). The second is the warrior "who dealt the first wound to Cumall in the battle of Cnucha" (§ 16). The warrior did not belong in the first of these accounts. He is not mentioned in (§ 2) along with Finn's other enemies in the battle, only an obscure phrase ("the man who kept Cumall's treasure-bag," etc.) referring to him has been inserted. In the same way two characters called Aed, both enemies to Finn, have arisen. The first Aed (the son of Daire the Red) is said to be the same as Goll mac Morna; the second Aed (the son of Fidga) is a fairy antagonist.

After the first few paragraphs Goll disappears from *M*. This first part of *M* doubtless comes from an annalistic source resembling the *Fotha Catha*, but differing from it in having no mention of Conn. The second part of *M* comes from something pretty close to a folk-tale. This source (X), which had some literary connection with

¹ See Nutt, *Folk and Hero Tales*, ed. MacInnes (1890), notes, pp. 399 f., and his table, p. 417.

² Nutt noticed this, *Folk-Lore Record*, IV (1881), 17, note.

the source of *Sp*, made Aed the chief enemy to Finn, and had little to say of Goll—that is, it was like Gilla in Chomded's poem, which does not mention Goll, although it refers to "the sons of Morna."¹

The *Fotha Catha* is also a piecing together of independent accounts. One of them was probably the tenth-century metrical *Dindshenchas* "Almu I" (ed. Gwynn, *RIA*, *Todd Lecture Series*, IX (1906), 72–77, from *LL*). This knows nothing of Goll, but mentions Fiacaill and Bodmall. The other source must have told of Goll.

At the risk of being tedious it is necessary to reiterate that none of the documents, not even those in Irish, are pure fairy tales. They have all been more or less rationalized by narrators who gave them a realistic setting.

XIV

What was the character of *X*, the common original of *Sp* and *M*? One or two passages which have been discussed above, where traces of a similar working up of an incident appear both in English and Irish, do not prove that *X* had developed far beyond the folk-lore stage. It was essentially a folk-tale because it preserved for the most part the original motivation. "Folk-tales do not leave the

¹ Goll seems to have taken the place of an older opponent of Finn named Aed, and perhaps the identification of Goll mac Morna and Aed mac Daire, which is made by *M* and the *Fotha Catha*, may be due to a harmonizer of different traditions. The notion that a supernatural person named Aed was one of Finn's chief antagonists is old. A ninth- or tenth-century prose tale, "Finn and the Phantoms" (see *Rev Celt.*, XIII, 17 f., and for the date *Fianaigecht*, p. xxiii), relates that Aed Rind, son of Ronan, slew a hundred of the *Fiana*, and many of their chiefs. Nobody dared to oppose this terrible foe except Finn. Cáilte finally made peace with him. Aed was received into the *Fiana*, and afterward lived by turns part of the time in his home, a fairy-knoll, and part of the time with Finn. Another Aed, a fairy chief who made presents to Finn, is mentioned in the *Acallam na Senórach*, 3640 f. (*Silva Gadelica*, II, 111). Among the graves of famous heroes is mentioned that of Aed mac Fidaig in a tenth-century poem in *LL* (*Fianaigecht*, p. xxiii). These Aeds are different personages but there can be little doubt that they were a good deal confused in the various tales, and they may hark back to a mythological Aed who was a giant and a demi-god.

In support of the hypothesis that Goll displaced an older Aed it may be remarked that, according to the ancient tale just outlined, Aed Rind was at first a [fairy] adversary who was later received into Finn's band. This is not unlike the story of Goll, who at first a foe became a companion to Finn. In *LL*, 204a, 32 (cf. *RIA facsimile*, introd., p. 54), is a poem ascribed to Finn about the exploits of Goll mac Morna: "'Give me my harp' cries the hero [Goll] 'that I may play it—grand the strain—that I may put the host to sleep.' So we were all put to sleep by the yellow-haired son of Morna. When sleep had overpowered us the foe [Goll] leapt on us and we were only awakened by the death shouts of the *Fiana*." Goll is here a foe who, after enchanting Finn's men with music, slays them, much as Aed, and Aillén did in the stories above related. My conjecture is that Goll mac Morna has developed out of an older Fomorian or one-eyed monster. The explanation that Goll was a sobriquet given to Aed after he had lost an eye by the spear of Luchet reads like a bit of rationalization. Cf. Schofield, *Mythical Bards* (1920), pp. 317, 352.

point of the story in the dark. Their hearers object to puzzles.¹ As far as the *enfances* framework is concerned, *X* closely resembled *M*, the main difference being that *M* omits supernatural features, most of which have left traces in *Sp*. It is for this reason that *Sp* cannot come from *M*, and since *M* is too old to come from *Sp*, both must go back to a common source, *X*. As for the "Finn and the Goblin" episode, *X* must have been like the older Irish tales in representing the "goblin" as troubling a feast (as in *Sp*) rather than as slaying a man as in *M*, or burning a city as in *A*. Some reasons for these conclusions are as follows.

M explains why the hero's name was kept secret, a point that needs clearing up in *Sp* and in all the related stories, but is never elsewhere adequately motivated.² In *M* the foster-mother's chief desire was to keep Finn's name and whereabouts from the knowledge of the sons of Morna and especially from Goll, his father's foe, because they were watching to kill him. The point is made abundantly clear.³ A comparison with *M* enables us to comprehend why, in *Sp*, Perceval is ignorant of his name. His mother had kept it secret for fear of the Red Knight, that uncanny foe who had slain the father, and was, doubtless, on the watch to kill the son. We also understand the namelessness of Perceval in Chrétien's romance and in all related stories. Chrétien appears to be puzzled by the idea,⁴ for he does not set it forth at all clearly. This explanation for

¹ Quoted from Professor Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight*, p. 249.

² *Lanzelet*, which in the *enfances* portion has suffered less from rationalization than any other cognate tale outside of Celtic story, comes as usual closest to the real point here. The *merminne* told Lanzelet that he should not know his name until the day that he should slay the terrible Iweret.

³ The women warriors "carry away the boy, for his mother durst not let him be with her." "The boy was secretly reared. That was indeed necessary for . . . the sons of Morna were lying in wait" (§ 4). That was why his mother visited him secretly. "She was afraid of the sons of Morna for him" (§ 5). He fled "from the sons of Morna" (§ 7). The women warriors told him to leave them because "the sons of Morna are watching to kill thee" (§ 12). That was why he did not reveal his name to the King of Bantry (§ 13); or to the King of Kerry (§ 14). That was why he went to learn poetry "for fear of the son of Urgriu and of the sons of Morna" (§ 17).

⁴ Ed. Baist, *Li Contes del Graal*, vv. 340 f., 3535 f. B1 (*Bliocadrans' Prologue*), ed. Polvin, 739-42, says that when the boy was baptized, his name was so called that it was never known, or announced, or perceived:

"Ses noms fu issi apielés

Com s'il, onques ne fust véus

Ne nonciés, ne apiercéus." 740.

(Ms. Add. 36, 614, reads "séus" Miss Weston, *Sir Perc.*, I, 71, note).

In fact the lad's name is never given in this *Prologue*. This is one of the marks of a hero brought up by a *fée*. He is nameless till he accomplishes his adventure. Cf. *Parzival*

the namelessness of the hero was in *X*, since in all the romances that may be supposed to derive from *X* this namelessness appears without apparent reason. In the romances the original motivation has dropped out because their authors did not understand (what would be clear to any Celt) that the plot involved a struggle between two clans.

The Red Knight's yearly theft of King Arthur's golden cup, which is never adequately motivated or explained in *Sp*, or Chrétien, or any of the related romances, can be understood by a comparison of the "Goblin" episode in *M* and other Irish stories. To Irish hearers, familiar with fairy lore, the conduct of the "goblin" was no puzzle. The king was under a spell or enchantment cast by the "goblin," the sign of which was that every night or every year the fairy molested his feast, just as according to modern Irish peasant belief cows when under enchantment are supposed to be visited by the fairies nightly, or at stated intervals. This explanation, which is clear enough in *M*, must have been in the source *X*. *X* was, then, practically a folk-tale and the main thread of its plot is well preserved in *M*.

XV

Was *X* Irish? The purpose of this investigation is to try to restore the folk-tale source of *Sp*, and thus to unravel the original motivation, which will appear plainer (if our hypothesis of popular origin be correct) the closer we get to the folk-tale. For our immediate purpose it matters little among what people the story arose, so long as we can grasp the point of it. The discussion, however, has made clear that *X* resembles a set of Irish tales (especially *M*) which are older than the rise of French Arthurian romance. In the complete absence of any other tales of like antiquity that closely resemble *Sp* the conclusion is almost inevitable that *X* was Irish. *M* contains the *enfances féeriques* formula and this formula, therefore, appears to have been worked out by the Irish long before it can be pointed out anywhere else in the west of Europe.

(ed. Martin, 113, 4), *Li Biaus Desconens, Libeaus Desconus, Enfances Gauvain* (Romania, XXXIX [1910], 1 f.), and *De Ortu Waluuanii* (ed. Bruce, *Hesperia* [1913], pp. 59, 92). In *De Ortu* the hero is called "puer sine nomine."

Any lingering skepticism about the antiquity of the *enfances féeriques* formula in Irish¹ must be dispelled by the existence of an older example, which is contained in two texts: the *Macgnímrada Conculaind* and the *Tochmarc Emire*, concerning the great antiquity of which there is no doubt in anybody's mind.

The *Macgnímrada Conculaind*, or "The Youthful Deeds of Cuchulinn," is a part of the *Táin Bó Cualnge*, and belongs substantially in its present form to the eighth century.² We here read that Cuchulinn was brought up at a distance from the king's court, although not by *fées*, and went thither as a boy. Like Perceval, Cuchulinn was a nephew to the king (Conchobor), but the latter had no knowledge of him, and inquired the boy's name. Like Finn and Perceval, Cuchulinn was swift enough of foot to run down deer, and he shot water birds (swans). Like Finn he killed some of the boy troop with whom he played. Like Finn he did not get the name by which he is generally known till he had accomplished a great exploit. He slew the dog of Culann the Smith, and because he offered to take the dog's place as watcher he became known as the Dog of Culann, "Cu-chulinn."

Cuchulinn, according to the *Macgnímrada*, was trained at first in the house of his father Sualtam,³ but, like Finn and Perceval, he went later to be taught by fairy women. This part of his youthful adventures is not told in the *Macgnímrada*, but forms a part of another text, the *Tochmarc Emire*.⁴ When Cuchulinn was six years old (according to *LU*), and had done a number of exploits, he set out to secure training in arms. He accomplished a dreadful

¹ *Enfances féeriques* are ascribed to Dermot ("He studied with Manannán mac Lir, and was brought up by him in the 'Land of Promise.' He was taught by Angus mac Oc, son of the Dagda," *Silva Gadelica*, I, 266; II, 300), but the story of Dermot's youth does not, so far as I know, exist.

² J. Dunn, *Táin Bó Cualnge* (1914), p. xvii; Faraday, *The Cattle-Raid of Cualnge* (1904), p. xvi. The Irish text summarized above is in Windisch, *Irische Texte*, extraband (1905), pp. 106-171.

³ This story of Cuchulinn's education at the house of his father Sualtam is probably not primitive, although far older than the twelfth century. Cf. Kuno Meyer, *Miscellanea Hibernica* (University of Illinois Studies, 1916), pp. 9 ff.; T. P. Cross, *Modern Philology*, XVI (1918), 219 f. According to the oldest stories, Cuchulinn was not the son of Sualtam but of the demi-god Lug; see Nutt, *Voyage of Bran*, II, 43 f.

⁴ A shorter version of the *Tochmarc Emire* (in MS Rawlinson B512), which contains all the points here summarized, is thought by Meyer to date from the eighth century, *Rev. Celt.*, XI, 439. A longer version (from *LU* and later MSS) has been translated by Meyer, *Archaeological Review*, I. No use is here made of any point peculiar to this later version except the statement that Cuchulinn was but six years old, which occurs in *LU*; see Faraday, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

journey across the Plain of Ill Luck to reach the land of Scathach (The Shadowy), compelled her to give him instruction in arms, to become his mistress, and to foretell to him the future. In winning Scathach he was helped by her daughter Uathach (The Terrible), who fell in love with him. Before winning Scathach he slew a champion named Chocur Crufe, whose place he took. He later fought in battle on behalf of Scathach against another supernatural queen named Aife, and won a victory.

This story from the *Tochmarc Emire* is plainly a folk-tale that has been arranged to fit into the artificial heroic saga of Cuchulinn. It, taken together with the *Macgnímrada*, demonstrates the existence in Ireland, more than three hundred years before the rise of French and English romance, of a folk-tale about a hero who had a youth parallel in several points to that of Finn and Perceval, and who like them was trained in feats of arms by two women of the Other World.¹

Since the antiquity in Irish of the *enfances féeriques* formula is beyond dispute; since *M*, the closest parallel to *Sp* that we have been able to point out, is Irish, and is evidently too old to be influenced by Arthurian romance, it seems impossible to avoid concluding that *X*, the common original of *Sp* and *M*, was Irish.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

(To be continued)

¹ Whether the folk-tale from which sprang this episode in *Tochmarc Emire* belonged to the fairy mistress type or not is of no consequence to the argument. We are concerned only with the fact that Cuchulinn as a youth visited the Other World and was there trained by supernatural women, which is sufficiently obvious in *Tochmarc Emire* as it stands. Professor Ogle's failure to see in Scathach a fairy mistress (*Amer. Jour. of Philology*, XXXVII [1916], 403 f.), therefore, does not matter here. His objection, however, makes it worth while to say very explicitly that neither *Tochmarc Emire* in this episode, nor *M*, nor *Sp*, nor (e.g.) Chrétien's *Ivain*, is a fairy mistress story as it stands. Nobody ever thought so. My point was, and is, that nobody can understand or explain any one of them except by restoring a more original folk-tale form in which it was a fairy mistress story. Why keep repeating "Laudine ist keine fée"? (Foerster, *Yvain* [1906], pp. xlvii et al.) In the entire absence of any evidence to the contrary I see in Scathach and her "daughter" Uathach (Do not let us take the relationship of fairies seriously!) the usual pair of supernatural women, like Lunet and Laudine (*Ivain*), the *merminne* and *Ibils* (*Lanzelet*), *Blancemal* and *Blances Mains* (*Li Biaus Desconeüs*), the sisters in *La Mule sanz Frain*, the sisters *Lí Ban* and *Fand* in *Serlige Conculaind* (and, as the argument tends to prove, *Acheffour* and *Lufamour* in *Sp*), who control the hero's destiny. That both Scathach and Uathach (and Aife as well) were mistresses to Cuchulinn shocks literal-minded people who do not comprehend that these creatures were *fées*. Be it remembered that *Lanzelet* was accused of having the *merminne* as a mistress (*Diu Crône*, 24517 f.). Uathach plays the part of Lunet because she meets the hero first, helps him and tells him how to win Scathach. Both in this episode from *Tochmarc Emire* and in *M* an original fairy story has been obfuscated in adapting it to the supposedly historical figures of Cuchulinn and Finn. The element of fairy control has been pretty thoroughly obscured, doubtless because it did not accord with the spirit of heroic saga, which tended to exalt the hero's hardihood.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace. By WILLIAM HENRY SCHOFIELD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, Vol. V.) Pp. xii+381.

Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace, by the late Professor William Henry Schofield, of Harvard University, is the outcome of studies designed to lay the foundation for a *History of English Literature from Chaucer to Elizabeth*, which the author planned as a continuation of his *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*.

Professor Schofield's book deals primarily with the problem of Blind Harry and the well-known fifteenth-century *Life of William Wallace*, so long attributed to him. After reviewing previous critical opinion, the author states his general conclusions as follows:

I assume that the author of the *Wallace* was called Blind Harry; but I believe that he was not a minstrel at all in the ordinary acceptance of the term, and that he was never blind. I venture to hold that Blind Harry was only the author's pseudonym, and I shall try to establish the existence in myth and show the nature of the strange personage who has always been treated as the author of the work [pp. 12 f.].

While accepting John Major's evidence that at the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century the *Wallace* was attributed to a poet called Blind Harry, Professor Schofield believes that the name Blind Harry—like Blind Homer, Blind Tiresias, and Blind Ossian—is the work of traditional mythopoeic imagination. In an interlude written by Dunbar about 1500 a dwarf calls himself "Blynd Hary, That lang has bene in the Fary, Farleis to fynd," and asserts that he is descended from the Ossianic heroes Fyn Mac Kowle and Gow Mackmorne—facts which, taken in connection with a large body of evidence from popular tradition, indicate to Professor Schofield that by the beginning of the sixteenth century the Wallace-poet was regarded as a seer who, like Ossian, Thomas Rhymer, and other mythical personages, had derived supernatural knowledge from a sojourn in the other world and who had been punished with blindness for some breach of supernatural law.

"To all intents and purposes the *Wallace* is an anonymous book" (p. 116). A study of the content of the poem shows that the author, far from being an itinerant bard *a nativitate luminibus captus . . . qui historiarum recitatione coram principibus victum et vestitum quo dignus erat nactus est* (cf. *Mythical Bards*, p. 291, note), was a clever, self-conscious artist who was fond

of imitating Chaucer and who aimed at literary display (p. 126). In order to induce his readers the more willingly to accept the fictions in which he clothes the figure of William Wallace, he uses devices which suggest those adopted by the author of *Sir John Mandeville's Travels* and "that arch-impostor of the Middle Ages, Geoffrey of Monmouth . . . who with similar humility asserted his reliance solely on a mysterious book which he alone was privileged to possess, and with similar anxiety protested the sooth-fastness of his account, though it might not tally wholly with the information obtainable from other sources" (p. 118). Writing about 1483, when Scottish indignation against England ran high, the Wallace-poet was intent upon fomenting strife, and to this end he chose as his theme the exploits of a national hero who had valiantly opposed the Southron and, as a mouthpiece, a bard who, like Ossian and Billie Blin, alias Odin, had loved enmity and discord (p. 160). He was neither a quiet scholar nor an amicable, chivalric ecclesiastic, like Barbour, with whom he has been compared, but "a vigorous propagandist, a ferocious *realpolitiker*, without principle when it was a question of Scotland's place in the sun, without reluctance to lie in manipulating history to his own end" (p. 146). The worthy French clerk, "Master Blair," whose "Latin book" the poet explicitly mentions as his principal authority, is comparable to Chaucer's Lollius, and may be an echo of Master Blaise, the fictitious recorder of the deeds of Merlin (p. 176). Professor Schofield's book deserves well of the republic of letters for having dispelled once for all the fog of guesswork and pseudo-scholarship by which the real Wallace has so long been hidden.

But *Mythical Bards* is far more than a careful study of an oft-misinterpreted Middle Scots poem. The author brings a large number of Celtic and Scandinavian documents to bear on the solution of problems in early Scottish literature, and his conclusions point the way to much-needed investigations in this field (cf. p. 163). The vexed Homeric problem appears less complicated when viewed in connection with the fabled writer of the Wallace and with other "blind" poets. By collecting a large amount of material dealing with primitive conceptions regarding the source of poetic inspiration, the author throws a flood of light on early attempts to solve the riddle of genius and on ancient critical theories of its origin and scope.¹ In general, *Mythical Bards* is marked by the broad scholarship and the keen vision of literary problems which have always been the chief characteristics of the author's work.

By Professor Schofield's death scholarship has suffered an irreparable loss. Few teachers have ever presented the literary treasures of the Middle

¹ How much early assertions regarding Homer and the bards, scalds, and minstrels of the Middle Ages influenced conceptions of "original genius" and "nature poetry" during the Romantic period, the writer of this review hopes to show at an early date. Professor Schofield's study forms an indispensable background for the study of this and other important problems in Romanticism.

Ages in a fashion more likely to catch the ear of the modern world. Yet, in spite of the growing tendency in education to discredit the value of research, Professor Schofield never lost sight of the high and holy aim of learning. The inspiration of his work has been felt by men who never sat under his instruction. By those who have studied under him he will ever be remembered as a stimulating teacher and a genuinely disinterested and sympathetic friend.

T. P. CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Old and New, Sundry Papers. By C. H. GRANDGENT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. Pp. 177.

Old and New, Sundry Papers, is the title of a volume containing eight essays and addresses by Professor C. H. Grandgent, of Harvard University. Though covering a rather wide range of subjects, the papers included "have this in common, that they treat, in general, of changes in fashion, especially in matters of speech and of school" (Preface).

"Fashion and the Broad A," "The Dog's Letter," and "New England Pronunciation" are scholarly yet delightful essays on subjects which should interest every student of language. If there were more philologists like Professor Grandgent, Mr. H. L. Mencken would have less occasion to complain that American college professors investigate forgotten dialects to the neglect of living English. In "Numeric Reform in Nescioubia" the author by the use of a parable seeks to convince a recalcitrant and osteocephalic generation that the current mode of spelling should be changed for one less hampered by tradition. In "School" and in the address on the teaching of modern languages he demonstrates with irresistible logic that the shortcomings of modern education are largely attributable to inadequately trained teachers, lax standards of instruction, "easy" substitutes for the old humanistic curriculum, and other features of the new "democratic" movement.

"Nor Yet the New" should be read in connection with "The Dark Ages," which was listened to with such keen pleasure by the members of the Modern Language Association a few years ago. In these two papers Professor Grandgent points out how much the Modernists have lost by attempting to cut themselves off from the past. In pictorial and literary art, in education, and even in morality "the insurgent attitude has now become a pose." Professor Grandgent believes that the whole Modernist educational propaganda "is based on the false assumption that knowledge can be acquired without painfully conscious effort, if we but pick out alluring kinds of knowledge," and that its greatest danger "lies in its coincidence with the innate laziness of man." With honest seekers after truth in the field of

educational method, Professor Grandgent has no quarrel; he is striving against those who listen with credulity to the honeyed whispers or cacophonous blather of monohippic pedagogical theorists and who in their spiritual blindness follow the leadership of educational demagogues.

Professor Grandgent is no mere theorist. His conclusions are based on a long and successful career as a scholar, a teacher, and a school administrator. All who love wisdom and sound doctrine should read his words with attention; and they should ponder them in their hearts, for, in the language of Professor Grandgent's favorite poet, *non fa scienza, senza lo ritenere, avere inteso*. If it be true, as Holy Writ asserts, that the wise "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament," those who are willing to profit by Professor Grandgent's observations have an assured place in the galaxy of the future.

T. P. CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

